"That They All May Be One"

Class 280.3 Q Book H137
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Rev. A. S. Dealey

A. Sidney Dealey

Canaseraga N.Y.

Dec 21: 1908

A present from the Author

M. J. C. Hales

Wilson, N.C.

"That They All May Be One"

A Plea for the Reunion of Christians

"To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." St. James iv: 17.

"Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. vii: 21.

BY A LAYMAN.

PUBLISHED, 1908, BY
THE FRANKLIN PRESS COMPANY,
PETERSBURG, VA.

250.3 Q
H137

60664

COPYRIGHTED, 1908
THE FRANKLIN PRESS COMPANY
PETERSBURG, VIRGINIA.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

To every Christian man and woman who, whatever sect or denomination they are in communion with, are *Christians* before they are *partisans;* who do not consider their denomination of more importance than Christianity itself; and who feel that the unity of Christendom is a far higher aim and duty than the perpetuation or continuance of any sect or denomination, and who wish to follow the Apostle's injunction: "Whether therefore ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." I Cor. x., 31.

IT IS WRITTEN

In that spirit of charity, "that envieth not, seeketh not her own, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; hopeth all things, that charity that never faileth." I Cor. xiii., 4-7. If there is any harsh or unkind expression in it we wish it unsaid.

"Some men will fight to the death and persecute without pity for a religion they do not understand and whose precepts they habitually disregard." (*Unknown.*)

"No matter how much good Christians do and how Christian their character, if their Christian work is done, not as individuals in the one Church, but as organizations separate and independent of that Church, then, by their separate existence they sanction and perpetuate the principle of division and the sin of schism which the Church and the scripture condemn; and it is precisely because the various Christian denominations teach so much truth, and their members exhibit such holiness of life, and accomplish such good work in many ways and become so influential and so greatly respected by all sincere men, that they lend respectability to the principle of division and make it seem justifiable and harmless, when in its ultimate results it is destructive of all that makes Christianity a power in the world and is absolutely contrary to God's law."—*Catholic Principles.*

CONTENTS

DEDICATION 3

AXIOMS 4

PREFACE 6–7

CHAPTER I—The Sin and Resulting Evils of Our Divided Christianity 9–40

CHAPTER II—Protestanism and Christian Unity.... 41–61

The Main Difference of Opinion Between Christians 61

CHAPTER III—The Mode of Baptism—Immersion and Affusion 63–80

CHAPTER IV—Infant Baptism 81–90

CHAPTER V—Predestination and Election 91–102

CHAPTER VI—Church Government 103–132

CHAPTER VII—Roman Catholicism and Christian Unity 133–156

CHAPTER VIII—Anglican Catholicism and Christian Unity 157–183

EXTRACT FROM JOURNAL GENERAL CONVENTION, 1886..184–185

EXTRACT FROM PASTORAL LETTER, 1892.....186–187

FINAL WORD 188

RECOMMENDATIONS 189

PREFACE.

"Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul"? I Cor. i. 12-13.

In these days we have the same partisan feelings and contentions among Christians as in those old days when Paul was told by "those of the household of Chloe" that there were contentions among the Corinthians." I am of Luther, I of Calvin or of Knox, I of Wesley, I of Coke or of Asbury, I of Campbell, I of Dowie, I of Eddy, etc., and we can imagine St. Paul asking again, "Is Christ divided? was Calvin crucified for you? were ye baptized in the name of Campbell?"

There are millions of Christians, members of the various denominations, who, with the love of Christ in their hearts and conscious only of doing the very best in their power for the salvation of many souls never realize the great harm that is being done His cause by working separately. St. Paul thought he was serving God when he was persecuting the Christians. May it not be that Christian men and women of our day by their partisan and divided efforts, are, like St. Paul in his day, creating havoc and dismay among the Christian ranks while feeling that they are serving God? The good they are doing is undeniable and immeasurable, but it is counteracted to a serious extent by the good, they have not done and cannot do in their divided condition, which they could do by "striving together for the faith of the gospel."

It is the earnest hope of the author that this book may help in some small degree to turn the serious attention of Christian men and women and Christian denominations to the great harm being done by the good left undone by a divided christianity.

If it be thought that the spiritual element in Christianity is, in this argument, subordinated to the outward, visible organization, it must be remembered we are pleading for that divine organization our Saviour Himself instituted, and that the individual Christian can be more spiritual, under a divine conception of the Church, than in any human organization.

There is not much original in the arguments set forth in this book save perhaps their setting. The author has made no effort to make any new or original argument, but has used material wherever he could find it; when convenient and appropriate the author is given, but in many instances matter from other authors is incorporated in paraphrase when a better expression of the idea is gained thereby. The ground has been gone over so many times and by so many able Christian scholars that there is not much new to be said.

CHAPTER I.

The Sin and Resulting Evils of Our Divided Christianity.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." I Cor. i. 10.

"Only let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ; that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel." Phil. i. 27.

"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou has sent me." John xvii. 21.

Every body of Christians in the world believe in the Bible as the inspired word of God. Some claim it as their sole basis and foundation, and repudiate every other authority or explanation; while others hold it as in the nature of constitution and by-laws rather than as their foundation; but every one claims to believe it. Still, with such pleadings and prayer as above quoted, and many others like them, there seems to be very little real effort at unity. The divisions and redivisions and new formations are going on all the time, tho' there are spasmodic efforts here and there to stem the tide and to get together. The same sacred book that tells us to "repent and be baptized," to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel," to "do this in remembrance of Me,"

also tells us with equal authority, with equal emphasis, with equal importance, "Ye are the body of Christ" (I Cor. xii. 27). "There should be no schism in the body." (I Cor. xii. 25.) "Stand fast with one spirit and one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel." "Speak the same thing; have no divisions among you, but be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned." (Rom. xvi. 17.)

Those divisions of Christians known as "Protestant" claim the Bible as their sole basis and foundation, their sole rule of faith, and are rather given to criticising, if not even sneering, at their Catholic brethren for what they are pleased to consider their lack of Biblical allegiance and dependence. Yet the truth remains that the Protestant denominations have, contrary to St. Paul's pleadings and our Saviour's prayer, divided His Body into three hundred or four hundred parts—into three hundred or four hundred schisms—"are standing loosely with three hundred spirits and three hundred minds striving *separately* for the faith of the Gospel"—"speaking three hundred different things with three hundred divisions;" whereas their Catholic brethren, while claiming to have all reverence possible for the Bible as their own production, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, do not place it as their foundation stone, but feel that they have a far higher foundation in that they "are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, and built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, in whom

all the building, fitly framed together, groweth into an holy temple of the Lord" (Eph. ii. 19-21), and these have only one schism, the Roman schism, and are striving to "stand fast with one spirit and one mind for the faith of the Gospel."

St. Paul says the Church is Christ's body: "We, being many, are one body in Christ (Rom. xii. 5); "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (I Cor. xii. 12-13). "But now are they many members, yet but one body" (I Cor. xii. 20). "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (I Cor. iii. 11). For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread" (I Cor. x. 17). "And hath put all things under His feet, and hath given Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 22-23); and Christians to whom and with whom and for whom St. Paul is speaking have divided this Body and its chief corner stone, our Saviour, into three hundred parts.

Take your Bible and turn to 12th Chapter 1st Corinthians and read carefully and earnestly from 13th to 27th verses. St. Paul, comparing the church to the human body, carries his argument for Unity and against division to the point of showing that every separation weakens and maims the body, until, with the members separated one by one from the body, all must sicken and weaken and die, and were it not that our Saviour has promised to be with His Church till the

end of the world, we might in truth fear such catastrophe. What would a human body be with both arms, both legs, both eyes severed? How soon would all wither and die?

Is it not plain and apparent to every earnest, thinking man or woman that there can be only *one Church;* that only one Church, *one body of Christ* was ever thought of by the Apostles; that in the very nature of the thing there cannot be two, three or three hundred churches; that while there may be disloyalty to that Church, may be separations and schisms from that Church, that these schisms and separations cannot be independent churches or lawful or authorized parts of *that Church;* that if there can be only one Church—the Church our Saviour instituted and His apostles founded, the Church that reaches back to Him Himself—then every other organization, independent of, and separated from, that Church, disclaiming the authority of, and claiming equal authority therewith, is a schism from and rival of, His Church, and disturbs that unity St. Paul pleaded for and our Saviour prayed for, and consequently works terrible harm and injury to His Church's mission. Everywhere in the Bible the Church is spoken of as an active, living, working organization with all of her Apostles working, writing, preaching Unity. Wherein does any man or society of men derive the right, the authority or sanction to form a rival organization with such constitution as they see fit to frame and with such doctrines as suit their particular notions and call it a part of His Church? Can such organizations be other than schisms; the ecclesiastical anarchy that comes from the presumption of human

beings to start "churches" in order to inaugurate some fancy or to perpetuate some dogma?

What a discouraging, disheartening answer to our Saviour's prayer and St. Paul's pleadings in the name of the Saviour is presented by the several hundred rival, antagonistic divisions among the Christians of this one land? "That they all may be one that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," and the answer is three hundred separate, different and differing divisions, and the world does not believe. "I beseech you, brethren, that there be no divisions among you," and the answer is, "we are three hundred divisions," and all claim to be following the teachings of this same Saviour and the same Apostle.

I ask every earnest Christian our land over to ponder this—Christians of every name and division, pastors, preachers and laymen. Is it not full time to stop, take inventory and count the cost, and see if we are not losing about as much as, or more than, we are gaining

Are not the paths of our separate and disunited efforts to win souls to Christ strewn with doubt, skepticism, disbelief and infidelity of our own making? And, while we are making these paths through the world of sin, saving souls here and there perhaps, are not the piles of wreckage of men's faith that we are leaving behind us more menacing, more appalling than the ignorance in front of us? In our disunited and selfish and partisan efforts, are we not all the time lowering the Christian religion in the minds and hearts and souls of men when we could be raising men and women to the higher standard of Christ's Holy Religion? When we, separated and divided as we are,

influence some fellowman to enlist under Christ's Banner, are we not at the self-same moment, by our antagonistic divisions, undermining the faith and loyalty of some already enlisted, and destroying the confidence and even the respect of many a casual looker-on, who could be, by a united christianity, made an earnest, zealous Christian soldier?

St. Paul, in Ephs. 4th chapter, "beseeches us to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." "There is one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism" "till we all come in the Unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up unto him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

Could St. Paul plead more earnestly for or show more clearly the beautiful result of real unity? Are not our own spasmodic efforts at unity—union meetings here and there—only feeble glimpses of what St. Paul is trying to picture, "where the whole body fitly joined together and every joint supplying its full measure of strength maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Ought not we Christian men and women be ashamed of ourselves and stop just

this playing at unity when we know and acknowledge the great blessings real unity would bring?

"A house divided against itself" is certainly the picture of Christendom to-day, and this genius for divisions and formation of new sects day by day is working indescribable harm and injury to God's Kingdom.

Some person will feel that undue stress has been laid on some particular part of the Bible, or that there has not been enough emphasis laid on some one point that is uppermost in his mind, and he will forthwith start an organization having this point as his central idea; and, when he has succeeded in gathering together enough adherents, his movement, in the popular mind, becomes a "church." He overlooks, in his special hobby, that our Saviour instituted His own church at the beginning of Christianity, and that if there is one thing stressed in the Bible more than any other it is the evils of separation and schism, and the results are fast eating into the vitality of the Christian religion.

It is making partisans for certain leaders and teachers rather than followers of the lowly Jesus. Its tendency is rather to *secure members* for the various denominations than to *save souls;* to exploit some dogma, theory or opinion rather than to keep and be satisfied with the simple faith of the saints and apostles. The rivalry between the various religious bodies, the financial needs of the various bodies in order to exist, and the consequent striving to gain mere members, is causing more and more laxity of discipline, more and more concession, by ministers, to the individual whims, notions, caprices, prejudices and pride of members;

more and more letting down of the moral standard; less and less insistence on real true Christian living. Men are permitted to cloak, under church membership, such unchristian conduct and living as to bring reproach and criticism on Christianity that would not be countenanced if all were working in the "unity of the Spirit and bond of peace for the glory of God and the upbuilding of His Kingdom."

All of us know that if for good and sufficient reason, for some immorality or heresy, some highly respected member of any of the religious bodies, be excommunicated or suspended, he could find a home in some other rival organization, and be treated as a hero, as one who had become enlightened and discovered that his previous "church" was wrong, and had become convinced of the truth as held by the last body he had connected himself with; one who had at last discovered his error and corrected it. He would not be looked on as one deserving the reprimand, but as confirming his new associates in their opinion that they were right and the other wrong. And the outside, careless, indifferent looker-on sees these things, and he sneers and is confirmed in *his* opinion that the whole thing is a mere superstition. And Satan smiles his satisfied smile.

There are instances where people wedded to one denomination would prefer that their friends and relations should stay out of any church rather than join some other. A great many members of the various religious bodies in any small place become as clannish as the old-time Highlanders, or the Indian tribes of America, looking on their brother Christians as rivals and eyeing every movement with suspicion, and regarding with envy

their success in gaining members, with scarcely a brotherly Christian feeling entering their hearts; and this partisan, unchristian feeling and prejudice extends even to the little children in the Sunday-schools. Not all, by any means, we are glad to say, for there are many sincere Christian people who rejoice with heartfelt gladness whenever any new recruit is brought into the Christian fold, no matter where he fights.

Take any town of ten thousand or less people in this country, and there will be from half-dozen to half a hundred different religious bodies. In every such town in this country over, there will be one or two or perhaps three large congregations and the others will be small; in some places one denomination will be the largest and in others, some other; but all will be struggling for existence, all trying to live by almost any means, even to enticing away each others adherents. Take for example a town of only six religious bodies. There will be six church buildings in such a town costing, say, $100,000, and the cost of keeping up these organizations is, say, $10,000 annually, and there will probably be $25,000 or more debt on these properties. These responsibilities keep a steady drain on the resources of the members, taking all they can spare, thus cutting down their ability, interest and enthusiasm for other objects and charities however needy. The individual members, thus divided and separated, are trained to a narrow, partisan view of their duties to their fellowman and become blinded and deafened to the larger and broader calls of general charity, and many a case of sickness, cold, hunger and suffering is neglected thereby. There would probably be no charity organization

there, no provision for surgical or other hospital services for those too poor to pay, and God alone knows the suffering that cannot be alleviated for this reason. We all have known cases that could have been saved if taken in time, but who waited too long before begging help, and as consequence have gone to an untimely death.

There are no doubt hundreds, thousands of such cases suffering untold misery, not knowing what to do or where to turn, while six or more religious organizations, claiming to follow the gentle, loving Jesus, are using up their means, their energy and their humanity, meeting their separate, unnecessary expenses.

One large church, or at most two, costing, say, $50,000, with one clergyman and assistant, would do infinitely more good than all those there—would create more enthusiasm, more fervent zeal, more real piety, more inspiring worship, more unselfish devotion than is possible when divided into rivals as now; would cause millions and millions of people in and out of the Church to have more love and faith and respect for our holy religion. The interest on the saving in the cost of buildings alone would nearly pay all expenses, and the $10,000 now necessary for this purpose would relieve untold and now unknown suffering; make happy and comfortable many a miserable suffering man, woman and child and send the Gospel to every nook and corner of this and every other land.

There is only a certain amount of time, talents, energy and means at any man's disposal or in any man's temperament, and if these are to be used up quarreling over different views of what the Bible means

and in keeping up the many separate organizations that after all only express the different *opinions* of human beings, *every one of which could be easily held in the one Church,* then many a case of charity, many a real cry for help, many a call of distress will be unheeded and unheard and unknown that could be so easily, *so easily* relieved.

"Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels; for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them saying, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous unto life eternal." Mat. xxv. 41-46.

Nor is this all. There are mission fields in foreign lands, in heathen lands, and thousands of places and communities even in our own Christian land that need ministers, with several times as many as needed in every town the size of this and larger. Each denomination calls for mission funds to send the Gospel to the heathen *to save souls* and each sends its own missionaries—both money and men of several different religious bodies going to the same places, thus repeating the same wastefulness, the same divisions and the same chaos as at home, raising the same suspicion that it

is members wanted rather than to save *souls;* with the added danger of uncurbed partisanship among people of uncertain and varying education, civilization and temper. And *they* tell us to come back home and agree upon some uniform faith before expecting them to believe.

There is a great show of friendship, of confidence of working together, a great deal of mutual complimenting among the various denominations as in union meetings, at revivals, in exchange of pulpits; a great deal of talk of spiritual unity, but the truth of the situation remains that each is jealous of the other, envious of the other, striving—striving for members rather than souls. Each is afraid to let the other carry the Gospel by themselves here or elsewhere. We are told that in one small province of India it was recently ascertained that there were twenty different Christian denominations, each laboring for the conversion of the heathen, but each laboring with equal earnestness for the conversion of the others converts. No wonder the heathen say to us: "Go home and agree among yourselves as to what this Christianity is before asking us to believe in it."

Some one or some system is to blame for this state of His Kingdom which St. Paul calls His body. Brethren, Fellow-soldiers in Christ's army! all members of Christ's body! and all children of the same great God! is it not time, I ask you again, to stop and count the cost?

Says the Rev. John Langtry: "Another evil resulting from our divided condition is the exclusion of any definite religious teaching from our pub-

lic schools, and the consequent dishonor of God's Holy name. I assume that there can be no difference of opinion among Christian men about the desirability of instructing the children of our schools in these truths, upon the reception and practice of which, if the Faith be not all a delusion, their eternal destiny depends.

"And yet, in consequence of sectarian jealousy and rivalry, such instruction is practically excluded from those public schools where the great majority of our people must be educated. Hence our children are taught all the principles of secular education, all the facts of history and geography and science—all the precepts that are expected to guide them to usefulness and respectability in the world as—things about which all men are agreed, and the importance of which is denied by no one; but religion is omitted as either a thing not of sufficient importance to occupy any portion of the precious hours of childhood and youth; or, as a matter so uncertain, debatable and unimportant that the safest way is to let it alone.

"But the wasting of our means and the misapplication of our talents; the neglect of the poor and helpless and the great reproach to Christianity in presenting a divided front to the heathen and the elimination of Christian teaching from our public schools are not by any means all the evil results of a divided Christianity—of the separation of God's people. These evils are followed by another and worse. The Christian religion, including the Bible, stands upon the testimony of the Church. If that testimony is hesitating, divided and contradictory, it will be questioned and in many cases

denied and rejected. And yet this is just the kind of testimony, and the only kind of testimony, that denominational christianity can present to the world today. What one affirms another denies." (*"Come Home."*)

Doubt, disbelief, skepticism and infidelity both in and out of the church are increasing faster than ever before. People outside and members inside all the religious bodies are imbued with a callousness and indifference appalling. With every new sect or division or movement comes more and more doubt; and how can we expect otherwise with the various denominations presenting themselves as so many religious societies or clubs under the name of "churches" to be "joined" as one would Masons, Odd Fellows, Pythians, etc., presenting themselves for selection for any one to take choice, and with the right that these examples set to form one to suit one's own fancy if none now organized is satisfactory.

Most men and women join the church not as a matter of principle but because it seems to be the proper thing to do or because it is fashionable. With some it is only a fad and has no more hold on them than any other fad. Some join because moved thereto by the genius or personality of some gifted preacher; some because their fathers or mothers were in some particular church; some because their friend or acquaintance is the member of some church, and they think they will feel more at home there; some join what appears to be the largest or most popular church for business or social advantages. They have been told all their lives that it did not make any difference which they joined. This is in

the air everywhere, "one is just as good as another"—"all roads to the same place." It thus becomes not a matter of principle—this coming into God's Kingdom—but rather a matter of preference and example to be decided by the various influences and environments surrounding us. The idea that our Saviour and His apostles organized one certain visible Church and that the same Church has existed through all the ages and centuries and exists to-day—the same organization always—the witness and keeper of the truth for all time—is ridiculed and thus again the truth is lost in the multitude of prophets, each questioning the authority of the other.

And people of our day, influenced by their training, and their temperament and their environments, will drift into the acceptance of the opinions of Luther, Calvin, Knox, Zwingli, Brown, Coke, Asbury, Campbell, Dowie, and the numerous other leaders of present and bygone times without ever having any real idea or conviction of their own; and when once they choose their religious affiliation they assume a defensive attitude whenever there is a question raised. And yet Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, Dr. Coke, Alexander Campbell and the other men were only human beings, and while doubtless right in their protest against existing evils, certainly had no Biblical sanction or Apostolic authority for starting churches separate from and rivals to His Church, the Church He instituted and His Apostles organized, and thus setting the example and sowing the seed of separation and schism that has ripened into the full-grown ear of Christian anarchy of our day.

It is inconceivable to us that with so many earnest, pious, faithful, Christian men and women in all the various religious bodies, so many with the love of Christ in their hearts, with these conditions before them, with the prayer of our Saviour and St. Paul's pleadings and warnings in their ears, they do not bend every nerve to put an end to these divisions among Christians. There are millions of people who could not believe in Christianity itself, except as a moral influence, if they believed these separations right and proper—if they did not believe there is in existence to-day the same Church, with the same authority—the same divine organization as from the beginning—and that separation and schism from her is improper and unlawful.

Our Saviour says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Many a man is serving mammon to-day that would be serving God if the forces working for righteousness were all united as are the forces working for unrighteousness. How can we expect a man to leave a strong united army to come into one split up into many rival factions? It is a great deal to hope that a man will choose for Christ when such choice is complicated with a further choice between rival factions.

Is it any wonder that any thinking man who does not just want to drift with the crowd, who does not blindly follow where some one else has gone, who does not want to pretend something he does not feel and who uses his reason for the God-given purpose of reasoning, stops in doubt; and, in the multitude of varying doctrines, finally decides there is nothing in the whole thing save a system of religious clubs, no better, nor offering him any more pleasure or satisfaction, than those he

already belongs to, and finally turns his back on Christianity and ridicules it. And, who is to blame for it? Is it his fault that he does not believe Christianity with its miraculous supernatural foundation of the Saviour's birth and resurrection, when so many of those who would teach him have no more authority than he has, and do not *really know* anything more than he does?

The voice that could speak with authority and knowledge, and which could gain his confidence and inspire him with love and respect and faith in his Saviour, is drowned in the babel of strange sounds and he never hears it, or if he does, he only considers it as one with the others, and it has no real weight. The Church that, as an organization—not merely as a theory or a spiritual condition, but as a real definite organization—goes back to Him Himself, the Church that, as an organization, is based on these supernatural facts of the birth of Christianity and without which the Church could not be at all, this Church that, by her very historical continuity for all time, bears witness to these facts of Christianity, is looked on in the popular mind as only one with all these Christian bodies to the number of several hundred that have been organized by human beings in the last four hundred years. And thus her authority and mission are questioned and lowered.

"All roads to same place," is the watchword of those who have to defend the divisions as an excuse for existence—but roads are never ready built. It takes hard work to build a road. Trees to fell, stumps to be destroyed, ditches to drain, dirt to be thrown up, rock to be hauled and rolled and repairs constantly going on. If the force building this heavenward road is to be

divided up into three hundred different bands, how much slower must this road be built, the Christian's road from earth to heaven? With one band branching off here, another there, and another there, and so on, each building, under a different foreman, by a different plan *and all building parallels to the same place.* Three hundred roads to be built and kept in good condition. What a waste of money, men, and material? Would it not be so much better for all to build and work and travel on the same road? It might need to be a little wider, but how much quicker could it be built, how much easier kept in condition!

As a fair illustration of the aspect of Christianity as presented by our unhappy divisions, there is a little book called "Why I Am What I Am," in which the various religious *raison d'être* is given in a series of articles by the different ministers of New York city. There are articles on "Why I Am a Baptist," "Why I Am a Presbyterian," "Why I Am a Methodist," "Why I Am a Roman Catholic," "Why I Am an Episcopalian," "Why I Am a Disciple," "Why I Am a Friend," "Why I Am a Seventh Day Baptist," "Why I Am a Jew," "Why I Am a Unitarian," "Why I Am a New Churchman," "Why I Am a Congregationalist," "Why I Am a Lutheran." And, as an almost pathetic prophecy, the last article in the book is by Robert Ingersol, the infidel, called "Crumbling Creeds." Who can doubt that the cause of his infidelity, as well as that of thousands of others inside as well as outside the membership of the various denominations, is to be found in the glaring inconsistencies of people professing Christianity? One paragraph from the

article "Why I Am a Jew" is a fair illustration of how every thoughtful man must look at our claims and position until he has picked his way through the labyrinth of faiths, and beliefs, and of doctrines, opinions and dogma to the truth. Among other things the Jewish Rabbi says, "That wonderful phenomenon, the missionary to the Jews, warns us in the name of those who send him, out of pity for our benighted state, that we must believe in Jesus if we would be saved. Suppose I listened to him, my troubles would only just begin: I would not know which is the true church nor which baptism would cleanse me: I would not know the true *faith* nor would I know who could tell me—I would have to be in constant dread of hell fire without knowing how to avoid it. I would be confronted with the different and conflicting theories, dogmas and opinions of the various denominations, all basing their positions upon the same Scripture texts."

And this is emphasized by the heathen, who told some missionaries that if they would go back home and agree among themselves, his people might be brought to believe their religion.

Says the Rev. John Langtry: "The spectacle of one of our American villages has often been described with its few hundred, or it may be few thousand inhabitants, and with from half a dozen to half a hundred rival churches, each striving to live at the expense of the others, and using every effort to withdraw their adherents; each little community living in isolated alienation, if not in hostile antagonism, to every other; each straining every nerve, and resorting to every trick to

raise money enough to maintain itself, and most of them receiving grants from their respective missionary funds, instead of contributing, as in many cases they might largely contribute, towards sending missionaries to remote settlements and heathen lands. Oh, what a waste of money, what a waste of men, what a waste of learning, of study, of mental effort is involved in this unscriptural church-making prerogative which Protestantism has claimed for itself, and which has shattered the anti-papal hosts into helpless fragments; what alienation between those who ought to be walking together in the house of God as friends has it effected; how has it paralyzed the voice with which the Church ought to speak, and to deliver her message! How many ingenuous minds have become confused amid the jargon of voices calling to them, come with us! come with us! until they have first stood aloof and looked on in unbelief and scorn upon the shameful conflict until, at this moment, we are threatened with the loss of vast territories that have long ago accepted the Faith.

"Cast your eye over the face of Christendom to-day, and see what dangers are threatening us on every side. Can we think of Germany, the birthplace of this church-making sectism, as being any longer in any true sense a Christian land. Dr. Chrislieb, one of the staunchest and ablest defenders of the ancient faith, drew this picture some time ago of the condition of his native land and, judging from what one hears and reads, matters have not greatly improved since: "Wherever you go," he says, "Into the lecture room of the learned professor, or into the council-chamber of the municipality, or the barrack of the soldier, or the workshop

of the mechanic, or into whatever place of public or social resort, everywhere you hear the same tale, that the old Faith has become obsolete. The advance of modern science, it is said, has made all real belief in it impossible.

"Only fools or ignoramuses even profess to believe in it any more. And the results of this widespread unbelief are everywhere apparent. No new churches are being built, and no old ones are being repaired. Only five persons in a hundred, it is said, taking the whole of Protestant Germany, ever go to Church, and in the Capital only one person in a hundred. Everywhere religion is contemned and shoved aside, and the clergy, in spite of the vast learning and great ability of many of them, are utterly unable to stay the spreading deluge.

"Looking out upon the present aspect of the world, a recent writer says: "The natural result has followed—just now the papers are announcing that there is throughout Germany the most frightful outbreak of immorality of every kind, which the Church and the Government are alike powerless to restrain." No wonder that Strauss, one of the greatest of Germany's skeptical writers, asks at the end of his career, can we any longer think of ourselves as Christians? and he answers honestly we cannot.

"As to the state of things on the American Continent it is unnecessary to speak. The dark wave of unbelief which is sweeping up over all the earth is already breaking audibly upon our shores. The alienation from religion, and the unconcerned disregard of its claims is perhaps the most marked feature of our American life.

One of the most thoughtful, learned and orthodox of the New York Clergy has not hesitated to express the belief that the world (as it lies around him) is falling back with rapid strides into the very condition in which it was nineteen hundred years ago; that the very same philosophical speculations are being agitated, the same doubts expressed, the same theories put forward as to the origin of life and all things. The same contemptuous disregard of religion is beginning everywhere to be manifested as marked the days before the coming of Christ; while throughout the West a rude atheism is the pervading type of unbelief. Enough, however, has been said to bring home to us the fact that not only does the comparative failure of missionary enterprise, but the present aspect of the Christian world, call aloud to us to consider what can be done to unite the scattered forces of Christendom against these impending dangers.

"It is not meant that all these evils can be traced directly to the unhappy divisions of Christianity, and yet there is but little doubt that these divisions have started men on the paths which have issued in this wide departure from the Truth. Rome herself is responsible for these divisions which she now so bitterly anathematises.

"Rome made the first departure from the position of the Primitive Church, which teaches that the truth is one and unvarying, that the Faith was once for all delivered, that the office of the Church and of her individual members is not to find out new truths but to hold fast, and witness to, and explore and propagate the old truths, taught us by Christ and His Apostles; she first taught men that the truth was to be found, not

in the word of God and the testimony of the Church, unvarying through the ages, but in the opinions and decrees of a single infallible individual. The leaders of division only followed in her steps, only they made every man his own infallible guide, and taught him that he is to find the truth, not in the testimony of the Church, but in his own individual opinion, or fancy, as to what Holy Scripture might mean. And men have only been following on that track till they have come to the conclusion that it does not mean anything at all; that anything they may fancy is true, or that nothing is true. But however this may be, it is clear that the prayer of our Lord leaves us no room to doubt that the Christian world, in its present divided and distracted condition, will never be able to grapple with and overcome this widespread revolt. It may indeed be met and defeated here and there by laborious argument. But it would vanish away like smoke in the presence of a united Christendom.

"Another evil which necessarily flows out of this living contradiction of the will of our Lord is the practical overthrow of discipline. The lowering, in the whole Christian community, of the claims of truth and righteousness. There is a constant struggle going on amongst the various bodies into which we are divided, to gain converts, and so increase their own strength and influence; and the result is that those who have been censured or reproved, or even excommunicated, for some immorality or heresy, in one church pass, on some idle pretense, into another, and are generally welcomed with open arms and rejoiced over as men who have been at last enlightened, and have escaped from

some unfair or degrading system into one more enlightened and true.

"And so a constant lowering of faith and practice is going on, and all wholesome discipline in the Church is being rendered every year more difficult.

"Another startling practical consequence and evil of our divisions is our educational problem. An elaborate, well-constructed and costly system of education has been devised for the purpose of teaching our children what they ought to know. And lo! in a Christian land the only things which a teacher is not allowed to teach the children are the truths of the Christian religion. I was on a committee the other day, and I was ashamed to be on it, which practically asked the Government of Ontario to limit the amount of religious teaching that might be given our children to the Mosaic decalogue and the Lord's prayer. All the great, sanctifying, moulding, uplifting, guiding truths of the Gospel must be kept out of sight, or, at least, not taught, lest some Denominational corn should be pressed. The consequences of this practical agnosticism in school life are becoming painfully apparent, and men are crying out for moral teaching in the schools. But moral teaching which is not built upon faith is like the elephant upon which, in the Chinese mythology, the world stands. It stands upon nothing. Apart from belief in God, and accountability to Him, no morality will stand in the hour of temptation.

"But by far the worst evil that can be laid to the charge of our multiplied Denominationalism is the fact that it is the open defeat of our Lord's great Eucharistic prayer—"that they all may be one." The direct con-

tradiction of the will of God. Our Lord founded but one Church to be the ground and pillar of God's truth. The witness to and keeper of God's word. The family and household of God. The Bride, the Lamb's wife, through whom His children are begotten. He built that Church to represent Himself in the world when He had gone away—to carry on His work, to be His agent, the instrumentality by which His will should be accomplished and His kingdom extended throughout the world. That Church, as it presents itself to us in the New Testament, is a visible, organized society. Christ Himself instituted it. He appointed its officers; He prescribed the mode of initiating new members; He laid down its laws, unfolded its objects, instilled its motives, inspired its teachers, and sent it forth on its great mission to win the world for Him.

"To that Church thus organized He promised His presence till the end of the world, and assured it that, whatever its conflicts and perils might be, the gates of hell should not prevail against it. Of that Church the Apostle makes the declaration again and again that it is the body of Christ, that in which He dwells, through which He works. He says there is only one such body.

"For just as there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, so there is one body and one spirit; that by one spirit have we all been baptized into this one body; that we are all one body in Christ, and every one members of another," and He exhorts us to endeavor—as something hard of attainment—to keep this unity which the Spirit creates in the bond of peace.

"In the face of all this our divisions abound and continue, and Christian men are content to go on living in alienation and estrangement from one another." (*"Come Home."*)

To sum up these terrible results of the divisions of Christian people, in the words of an eminent clergyman: "The great God, looking down from Heaven, sees multitudes of his Cross-Signed people, scattered over various countries, and upon many continents, and in the islands of the oceans, to Him one people, to us of many nations, of many colors, of many kinds, to Him all one. He looks down upon these and sees Christian against Christian, Christian Creed against Christian Creed, Christian hand against Christian hand, His divine word taken up by rival societies absolutely. Think of it! The divine word of God taken up by societies who are not only not auxiliaries of each other, but literally rivals of each other. He looks down upon His soldiery and sees dissension, and mutiny and dismay through all their ranks. Imagine some General gifted with the ability to read the hearts of the multitude of all his soldiers scattered in various brigades upon the field of battle, and to know the thoughts of their captains and officers; and discovering their plans to be utterly variant and at variance with his; the only idea in common being that they can still fight but every man must fight his own way. What must be the result? How many battles would be won by a general with such officers and commanders? Well, this is the picture of Christendom to-day. The Presbyterians will only go out in this direction; the Methodists will only go in that; the Baptist in this and the Lutheran in that direction. The

Disciples are satisfied the others are frightfully wrong, and they will only fight their way, and the Universalists and Quakers and the hundreds of others will only skirmish around according to their own notions."

The evil consequences of this state of things is apparent to all men—no one thinks it is the right state of things or the best state of things.

The Rev. John Langtry again says: "If we could only bring about the unity, the real striving together for the Faith, what a vast power it would give us. Not one minister, not one Christian worker would be thrown out of work, as in other combines, but it would turn loose more than a hundred thousand men and hundreds of thousands of money to carry the message of salvation to untold multitudes who have never heard the loving name of Jesus, and these ministers and workers could see and feel the good results of their labors as never before."

"Out of these divisions there necessarily grows an alienation of sentiment and feeling and view of religious life which is more fatal to the spirit of Brotherhood than the doctrinal differences which have produced the divisions. The true spirit of brotherly love is destroyed and Christian charity is lost, and men who ought to be walking together in the house of God as friends and praying together, communicating together, counciling together are really regarding one another with suspicion and apprehension, and merely, and sometimes hardly, extend to one another the ordinary courtesies of life."

"These divisions have generally grown out of our doctrinal and ritual differences, and when made they have a natural and continued tendency to exaggerate

these differences and to widen and perpetuate the divisions they have produced. The men who separate naturally and necessarily dwell upon and magnify the doctrines and practises for the sake of which they separated. And the men from whom they separated are equally tempted to magnify the doctrines of their own faith that have been assailed, and to make little of and deride and perhaps finally deny the doctrines which the separators exalt. Hence there grows up on the one side or the other another gospel which, if it does not deny, yet leaves out of practical teachings important and sometimes essential truths.

"It is human nature to argue and plead for and hold to the position one assumes on any question, and this tendency is never more pronounced than in religious matters.

"The rivalry of sects, the need of reaching the popular ear supplies a strong though perhaps unperceived incentive to omit great Scriptural, and unfathomable and unpopular doctrines of our religion, and to dwell upon commonplaces which every one will accept, and sensationalism which attracts the crowd, and thus there is a constant lowering of the tone of doctrine and a gradual letting-go of the deeper things of religion.

"I know it will be felt by some that this is an exaggerated way of putting the case, and it will probably be said that whatever ills may grow out of our divisions, they are not such evil things in themselves; that we do not differ, after all, about essential doctrines. But if the doctrines are not essential then the divisions are high crimes against God.

"We are all, I am sure, trying to preach the one everlasting Gospel of Salvation through the atonement of the Cross. We all worship one Father; we all believe in one Lord Jesus Christ. But we are split up into hundreds of dissevered, alienated and sometimes warring religious bodies.

"And whatever way we may think of it, there is, there must be something wofully wrong in the present condition of things.

"It ought to fill us with deepest humiliation, and with the one conviction that "we all have sinned, we have followed every one his own way," and have been landed in this condition of shattered weakness. And the blame is not all on one side. The guilt does not all lie at one door. There have been coldness and deadness and provocation on the one side, and impatience and wilfulness and impetuosity on the other. And so we shall do well to admit the evil, and not to try any longer to throw the whole blame upon one another, but to set ourselves, under the guidance of God's blessed Spirit, to find a remedy, if we can. The task is not going to be an easy one. We have Denominational pride and tradition and prejudice, and sentiment and individual interest to struggle through, and it will take a long time.

"It may, I think, be assumed that most men are agreed that unity would be a good thing if it could be attained without the loss of truth or sacrifice of principle. Men do not any longer uphold Denominationalism because it encourages enterprise, and keeps alive the spirit of emulation—they have learned to realize with St. Paul, that emulation is one of the fruits of the flesh, and

that divisions plainly show that they who are responsible for them, "are carnal, and walk as men."

"There is another thing that we may assume for our comfort, and that is that the men of this generation are not, to any great extent, responsible for creating divisions. They were born into an heritage of Denominationalism, and are only responsible for doing what they can to remove the evils to which they have fallen heirs. But all of us are most surely responsible for our efforts to bring about the fulfillment of our Saviour's prayer, and St. Paul's pleading for us "to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment." (*"Come Home."*)

There is hardly any necessity to prolong this argument for unity—real corporate unity, the unity our Saviour prayed for and St. Paul pleaded for. I take it every Christian man and woman the world over would welcome the real genuine union of Christendom, but how is it to be brought about? That is the question. Who is to give away for this boon? Who will start? This book is written in the hope of rousing the serious consideration of Christian men and women. It may be that some will take it in earnest and pass the word along the line.

St. Paul's pleadings are as plain as any other part of God's Holy Word which we profess so earnestly and loudly and emphatically to follow. They are a part, and a very important part, of that Book on which so many hundreds of our religious denominations base their very existence. You, my reader, clergyman or layman, are responsible in your sphere for a continuance of this frightful, anarchistical, chaotic condition of the

Christian religion; this marring and tearing down of the beautiful, shapely temple of the Christian ages; for a continuance of this ecclesiastical flotsam and jetsam. Whether bishop, priest, presbyter, elder, pastor, deacon or layman of whatever name or degree, we have this responsibility, and we ought—in honor of the Saviour we profess to love—we ought to meet it. We cannot do this by shirking it or passing it on to our neighbor. We cannot thrust it aside as some one else's business. We cannot be idle and self-complacent under such condition, feeling that it is not *my* fault; I am not to blame; I am not responsible. We cannot deceive ourselves, feeling that things are all right as they are, and that *those* who feel dissatisfied can remedy the evils they complain of. We know in our inmost hearts this condition is terribly and woefully wrong. St. Paul did not say "form new churches," "divide up." "If one doctrine or creed or practice or worship or ritual or form or baptism or sacrament or preacher does not suit set up one yourself." He said, "the Church is one body," "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," "keep the faith in the Unity of the Spirit." "Let there be no divisions among you." "Be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment that by the effectual working of every part the whole body may be increased in perfect love."

It may be that the basis of reunion of Christians outlined further on in this book may be all wrong, may be chimerical, may be wasted time, but it is presented in all good faith. And, there is one thing that is certain—if Christianity be a fact, and not a delusion and a super-

stition:—if the Bible be true; if our Saviour prayed for unity, and if the Bible condemns division and schism, then, every man, or community of men, or Christian denomination, who claim to believe the Bible and at the same time give their support to the continuance and perpetuation of these schisms and separations must be guilty of that sin.

With Lutherans, Disciples, Congregationalists, Catholics, Roman Catholics, many different kind of Baptists and Methodists and Presbyterians, etc., etc., is it possible to bring all Christians into one fold? Is it possible to reconcile the many and varied interests, ambitions, doctrines, opinions and positions of the bodies separated as they now are? Let us examine some of these differences and see what can be done.

CHAPTER II.

Protestantism and Christian Unity.

"For, first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." I Cor. xi. 18-19.

The Protestant idea of the Church is, that it is not any *one particular* visible organization; but rather an invisible, intangible ideal; an abstract idea or system of religion, or spiritual communion, and that the Church is composed of all the various religious bodies professing Christianity, or of certain individuals who may or may not be members of these bodies.

Under this theory our Saviour did not institute, nor did His apostles organize, any one particular, definite Church to hold her power, her authority and her certain, definite, visible existence for all time; nor did they leave any certain authority to be over, and with, and part of that Church; but that He finished His ministry here on the earth and ascended into Heaven, leaving only His example and teachings; that what authority or instructions He gave His apostles died with them, saving only such as they wrote in their epistles and other writings; and that any man or company of men can form themselves into societies, calling them churches, with such rules and government and such application of His teachings as to them may seem desirable and proper

and most conducive and agreeable to their spiritual feeling and welfare.

Each body so organized may, and naturally does, think that its own organization is nearest the Biblical Church, and that its own practices, doctrines and government are nearer the Apostles' teachings than the others; but they still concede that others have equal right to feel the same way about their own. And any man, or company of men, who feel that some one or more points in the Bible, which particularly strike them, have not been emphasized as much as they think they should be, or emphasized more than they think they ought to be, can start a "church" for this purpose.

Under this conception there is no higher or more Apostolic authority on the earth now than that exercised by the respective Christian bodies, each claiming and exercising supreme spiritual authority over its adherents; and the only authority or basis for the church, or "any church," is the Bible; and as a natural consequence of this idea, every different denomination is entitled to interpret the Bible as to them may seem the proper way, there being, in their opinion, no present organized authority for, or keeper and teacher of, the Bible.

And under this conception it is the aggregation of all the various religious organizations, professing Christianity, so formed already, or which may hereafter be formed, that make up and constitute the Church of God.

I think this fairly presents the Protestant conception of the Church, and if there be some among the Protestant denominations who feel that it does not rightly

state their position on some points it can be said in explanation that this article is dealing only in generalities and not in particulars, in a serious, sincere effort to turn Christian thoughts towards Unity; and that the foregoing is certainly the position Protestant denominations assume toward each other; and this must be their real position if sincere in their mutual recognition of each other as lawful independent parts of the Church of God. They exchange pulpits and preachers with each other; they say to non-church members that they are privileged to and should join whichever "church" they prefer. They hold proselyting (which, after all, is no more than trying to show others what one holds to be the truth) as ungentlemanly, unchristian and debasing; and they hold that the ideas, dogmas, or opinions or "faith" of members of one denomination should not be interfered with by other denominations, thus setting forth that these are matters of opinion or preference and not of principle; and these ethics could only be right and proper on the theory that one body has as much right to exist as a part of the church as another, and that "a man can pay and take his choice."

However desirable and essential Christian Unity may be, and the Church regards it of more importance than any other movement in the world to-day; it seems plain that it cannot come and be permanent under this conception of the Church.

Unity can never come permanently under a theory that makes it right and proper for any man or society of men to form churches as he or they *think* they ought to be; or as he or they *think* the Bible teaches;

or as he or they *think* the Apostolic Church was; and then recognize such separate organizations as true, lawful parts of the Church.

Does a man as soon as he professes Christianity obtain the right and authority to start a church? If he does, then for what purpose were the warnings and pleadings against division? Did everyone of those three thousand who professed Christianity on the day of Pentecost derive the right to start a church? Were all the many millions of professing Christians during all the nineteen hundred years of the Christian era authorized to start churches? If so, then all the Bible pleading for unity and against division must be superfluous. There would be no sense in authorizing a man to start a church and then blame him for doing it. If a man does not obtain this authority by simply professing Christianity, then where is the authority for the several hundred "churches" into which Christians are divided? If these various divisions of Christians are not schisms from His Church, but are really lawful, authorized parts thereof, then their founders had the right to start them; and if they did have such authority, why has not every Christian the same right?

If Luther had the right and authority to form a church, Calvin had an equal right to start the Presbyterian church; if Robert Brown had the right and authority to start the Independent (now the Congregational) church, and if Holliman and Williams had the right to start the Baptist church, Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury had the same authority for starting the Methodist church, and if Alexander Campbell had the right to start the Disciples church, Alexander Dowie had the

same right to start the Christian Catholic church; and so on ad infinitum.

If it was *right and proper* for these men to start separate churches, what is the meaning of those portions of the Bible that *plead against* schism, separation and division? One or the other of these propositions must be manifest. If the Bible is the inspired word of God, then its pleading and warning against division and schism certainly condemns the divisions of Christians into so many sects. That is one argument. The other is: If these divisions are lawful and authorized, then their existence condemns the Bible. In other words, the Bible cannot condemn a system and at the same time authorize as lawful and proper that same system. And how can any man or society of men, no matter where or when, claim to be following the Bible, when they do themselves, or support and encourage others to do, of the very thing of all things which the Bible plainly condemns? Men can rightly and properly use their efforts to correct errors and abuses in the Church, but they cannot lawfully create division. It does not matter what they *think* the Church ought to be. If they really believe the Bible, they cannot form a schism or division from that Church, but must use their efforts for reform, and do their Christian work of whatever kind within the communion of that Church. The Bible is wrong or the divisions are wrong—which?

And if it be not right to have all these different bodies, is it right to have any one of them, and which one? Is it the one with most members? Did our Saviour leave His Church, with

which He would be until the end of the world, so that the only way it could be known was by the number of people who joined it? Is the identity of His Church to be decided by the number of adherents it may have? Is His Church to be decided by the leader who can gather the most followers? If so, it must change from time to time as the number of adherents varies, and the mission of the Church would be changed from saving souls to gaining adherents, and its members would become mere partisans rather than Christians.

Unity can never be permanent on a basis that makes it possible to have as many churches as there are human beings or differences of opinion among human beings, and the present number of the Protestant denominations goes to prove this; these separations and divisions having increased so rapidly that there are now almost as many separate organizations of Christians as there are years since this theory was first advanced.

Nor can St. Paul's pleadings "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions, but that all be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment" ever find its fulfillment under the conception that has no certain ecclesiastical authority over the Church and that acknowledges no higher authority for the formation of the Church than private human opinions of the Bible teachings, and at the same time denies that there is any existing authority or teacher of the Bible, and which, by its very avowed basis, allows *lawfully* any number of divisions.

This theory that the Bible is the sole basis for the Church and that acknowledges no authority for, or

keeper and teacher of the Bible, requires, for unity, that every man and woman of every nature and temperament and understanding, educated and uneducated, prejudiced and otherwise, shall read and understand the Bible alike—the Bible being the highest and only authority—and we submit that this is simply an impossibility. If the Bible is the basis and foundation, then there must be, for unity, some acknowledged authority for, some authorized keeper, some certain teacher of, the Bible.

After all, it is not the *Bible* that is the basis, even under the Protestant idea, because the Bible could only be the basis for one Church—one certain united Church; for the Bible is no basis for any division or separation of God's people, but most emphatically enjoins unity. It is not the *Bible* that is the basis—it is some person's or some organization's *opinion of the Bible meanings* that is the basis. The *Bible* can only be the basis for one Church, because only one Church could have made it the Bible. Only the *differences of opinion* of the Bible meanings could bring so many divisions, schisms and separations. The utter inability to agree on the Bible meaning, the continual dividing up on account of such varying opinions, is, itself, sufficient argument that for unity there must be some acknowledged authority and teacher of the Bible. Could the various denominations agree to-day on what books should go in the Bible? If they cannot agree on what the Bible so earnestly pleads for—unity—could they agree on the whole Bible? And if there was only one Church when the Canon of Scripture was settled, where is that one Church now, and where the authority for separating

from that Church? And if you take that one Church's Bible, how can you refuse her teaching of the Bible? And how defend the present divisions and separations from that Church? There is either a necessity for these divisions in face of the Bible pleadings, or there is not. It is child's play for religious bodies to hold certain opinions and practices important enough to maintain separate organizations, and, at the same time, in public and in union meetings, say in effect that the others are equally right; that the differences are not important, and that a man can take his choice. If important enough to maintain these separate bodies, how can they be matters of mere preference? Why get up in public and say the differences are not important, and still keep up the differences? If all are right, there is no need for the division, and if one is right enough to necessitate a distinct organization, the others must be wrong.

And if unity *could* come under this conception it could only be temporary; for the very basis of the union would ere long bring its dissolution; for, if every man is entitled to form a church on his own ideas of what the Bible means, and if separation and division be lawful, then unity would last just as long as the different temperaments, natures and ambitions of men did not clash, and no longer. All the congresses and federations in the world can never bring permanent unity on this basis; for even if a common plan could be agreed on, it would only be on the basis of the voluntary consolidation of equal interests, the mere relinquishing of what they consider their lawful rights for a common good; and it would not be very long before some would feel aggrieved, some corn be stepped

on, some hobby dismounted, some point not stressed enough or stressed too much, and one or another would exercise his right to withdraw, and dissolution would begin.

Unity can never come by accommodating the truth and faith to the various natures and temperaments and prejudices of men. The faith is one and unvarying, and human beings must accommodate themselves to it. Parts of the truth must not be taken for the whole. There can be no unity, no clinging together, unless, all cling to the truth.

The theory that "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," and that there is no higher authority for it, no witness or keeper or teacher of the Bible other than a man's own ideas or notions or opinions of the Bible, and that one man has as much right as another to his interpretation of the Bible, can never bring unity. When you think seriously of this, do you think it can? "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." (II Peter i. 20.)

Don't understand us for one minute as depreciating or underestimating the Bible. The trouble is not with the Bible. It is private opinions of the Bible that are wrong. No one can honor the Bible more than the Church that gave it to the world. The Bible is the inspired Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, and is sacred to the Church as having been her companion for nineteen hundred long years, her guide and comfort through her dark hours of martyrdom and persecution. There can be nothing on this earth the Historic Church honors more than the Bible, as is evidenced by the fact that more of

its sacred language is heard in her assemblies on a Sunday than in any other body of professing Christians; but she does not profess to put it as her foundation stone, nor is it alone the rule and guide to that body which listened to the words that fell from His lips and the lips of His holy Apostles.

The truth is that the Bible is no basis for the foundation of churches. It is not a plain book of instructions for this purpose, for the simple reason that the Church was instituted by our Saviour Himself and organized by His Apostles, He being the chief Corner Stone; and the Church so organized had been in existence three hundred years before the books which now make up the New Testament were selected by the Church under Divine guidance. There is not a single detailed instruction as to anything relating to the organization of the Church, for the simple reason that none were needed. Our Saviour gave His instructions in regard to His Church to His Apostles "until the day in which He was taken up; after that He, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandment to the Apostles, whom he had chosen, to whom He also showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts i., 2-3.)

The Church was at work with its ministry, its sacraments, its doctrines, its principles, its foundation, its rites and worship before a line of the New Testament was written, seventy years before all of it was written, and three hundred years before the writings were collected, and selected and declared the inspired Word of God as we have it. The Bible is a record of *things*

done—not instructions *how they should be done*—and letters and epistles of encouragement and advice to men and churches already at work. Hundreds and perhaps thousands of things were done by the Apostles and their bishops, elders, presbyters and deacons that are not recorded at all. Only a few, and these with very meagre detail, is given. St. Paul mentions, in several of his epistles, the names of a great many men who were evidently at work in the Church under him; but the details are scarcely hinted at, because the Epistles, Gospels, Acts and Revelations were written to and for men and churches already so familiar with the actual occurrences as not to need every detail.

Is not the anomaly of endeavoring to *form "churches"* on people's ideas of what the Bible means, when that Bible only tells *what was done by the Church already organized,* enough argument against this whole system? It is just as unreasonable as to say that a man can form the United States one hundred and thirty years after it became a nation on the basis of the history of the first ten years of its existence.

In trying to do this we have our Baptist brethren laying all stress on immersion as the mode of baptism and accusing their brother Presbyterians of perverting the Bible because they sprinkle in baptism, while the Quakers dispense with baptism altogether; we have Baptists and Disciples viewing infant baptism as a sinful mockery, while Methodists, Lutherans and Presbyterians consider the baptism of little children one of the most beautiful ceremonies of the Christian religion; and yet all these claim with equal sincerity that they follow the Bible only. We have some Baptists

holding predestination as their central idea, other Baptists holding free will; some believe in missions, others do not; some practice feet washing and others keep Saturday instead of Sunday; and still, all these base their position and contention on the same Bible; and each honestly believes the others to be wrong in their interpretation of the Bible. Baptists admit other denominations to their pulpits, call them brother Christians, but do not admit them to their communion table, thus refusing communion to people they call Christians. Disciples, while agreeing with Baptists on immersion and infant baptism, admit other denominations to the communion, thus admitting to their communion Christians they would not admit as members of their church unless rebaptized, thereby refusing church membership to people they invite to communion, and all feel that they are doing exactly as the Bible teaches. Universalists find all the sanction and authority they need for their position and doctrine in the very same Bible from which the Presbyterians have derived their confession of faith in which the non-elect are damned to eternal damnation. Some consider the Lord's supper, the communion of the body and blood of Jesus, a sacrament; others consider it only a memorial, and all base their belief on the same Bible. Congregationalists, Baptists and Disciples find the Congregational government for the church in the same Bible in which the Presbyterians find the Presbyterian, and the Methodists find the Episcopal government to be the apostolic government; and all these confusing, conflicting systems, dividing and separating Christians into hundreds of factions base their positions, practices

and doctrines on the very same Bible. Can we wonder at the Jew's words in the first chapter?

Can one seriously believe that the Bible, under private interpretation and with no authoritative interpretation, can be the basis for the Church; or that Unity of Christians can come under such a basis? Is not the Church *the Church* then, now and "always even unto the end of the world," because the Apostles organized it under our Saviour's instructions? And is not the Bible, *the Bible*, because the Church made it the Bible under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and has kept it ever since, and can now, as in all ages past, say that it is the Bible? The Bible owes its existence to the Church, not the Church to the Bible. The Bible is the creation of the Church, not a foundation for the Church.

If we put the Bible as of higher authority than the Church, as the basis of the Church, then what authority have we for the Bible or the Church? Who could then put their hands on the Bible and say with authority, this is the Bible—the inspired Word of God? Who could say it is the inspired Word of God save the Church that under divine guidance made it the Bible? And how could the Church know and declare it to be the inspired Word of God if it is the basis or authority for the Church? How could the Bible *record* the origin and acts of the Church for nearly two generations before it was written if it was the basis and foundation and authority for that very Church? The Bible could not come first and the Church first also. If the Bible comes first, as it must, if it is the basis of the Church, then it could not record

the acts of the Church, and if the Church came first and the Bible was its own creation under guidance of the Holy Ghost, it cannot be the basis. These inconsistencies are surely discrediting Christianity and lowering its power and influence; are surely undermining faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, faith in Jesus, belief in His miraculous birth and resurrection and everything pertaining to our holy religion.

And then, too, it will be seen in a later chapter that those Christians who have the Catholic and Roman Catholic conceptions of the Church, could never hold the faith in the Unity of the Spirit and bond of peace in a system of religion based simply on human ideas. These Christians could never believe that His Church was left in such condition or that His instructions were given so carelessly, or that His Apostles organized so loosely and so weakly that these present divisions and separations could be lawful and proper; that He left His Church in such condition that this quarrelling, this bickering, this misunderstanding, this prejudice among His children should lawfully and naturally result; or that His people should be afflicted with the ill-will, strife, envy and antagonism that now beset them. To them there would be no such thing as a Church in reality, if all there was to it is the human idea that He left His Church to find its way through all the ages of the world without any definite authority; to be divided up into hundreds of conflicting systems; with nothing definite that men in all the different ages of the world can lay their hands on and know it is the Church.

The Protestant conception of the Church is only about four hundred and odd years old, and the adherents of the various Protestant denominations have been dividing up and separating from each other all these years. The Christian religion is one thousand and nine hundred years old. If these conflicting systems be the only authority for Christianity; if they represent the proper condition of the Church, then the conclusion in the thoughtful man's mind is that there is nothing in it at all, because he realizes that a matter of such tremendous importance as the Christian religion, with its miraculous, supernatural origin—the Incarnation, Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ—necessitates the most thorough organization to testify to it everywhere in all ages to all people. If this organization ever existed it is existing now with the same divine mission and authority as at first, because our Saviour promised to be with it 'till the end of the world. If an organization is only ten years old can it testify to facts which happened nineteen hundred years ago? Can any organization one hundred years old, two hundred years old, or three hundred years old, or four hundred years old, testify to facts they ask us to believe which happened nineteen hundred years ago? If their organic connection with the Apostles be broken; if they have lost their continuous succession from the Apostles; if, as they say, there is no definite succession to the Apostolate, how can they, or any one, testify to the origin and facts of Christianity? No one and no organization can testify to facts that occurred before their own origin. If a man questions can they relieve his doubts?

Men, women and children, under stress of great emo-

tion, in the excitement of some revival meeting, intensified by deathbed and other harrowing narratives, are induced to join some religious denomination; but do they in all cases, or even in most cases, really believe the great supernatural facts of Christianity, the miraculous birth and resurrection of Jesus? Can they confess with their hearts and souls as well with their lips that "Jesus is the Son of God?" Passive acquiescence is not *believing*. Taking a thing for granted, or not disputing it, is not *believing*. Faith is an active principle. It is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for. What evidence is offered by bodies, one, two, or three hundred years old, who themselves deny any organized succession from the Apostles?

If a sincere seeker after the truth hears the Gospel preached by Lutherans, the oldest of the Protestant denominations, and asks how they know what they ask him to believe, when their organization started fifteen hundred years afterwards, what can they answer him? If a man, not a professing Christian but sincerely interested, in good faith, asks a Presbyterian for their authority for what they ask him to believe when their organization is fifteen hundred years later starting, what can they answer him? If he asks a Congregationalist, or a Baptist, whose organization started sixteen hundred years later, what can they answer him? If he asks the Methodist which started seventeen hundred years after, or if he asks the Disciples which is eighteen hundred years after, how will they answer him? Can Luther, Calvin, Knox, Boccold, Brown, Coke, Asbury, Campbell, or any other human being, or human organization, speak with any

convincing authority regarding the facts of Christianity that occurred fifteen to eighteen hundred years before them, when they themselves deny any Apostolic succession, any organized connection with those facts, or any representatives on this earth of those eleven to whom our Saviour gave His instructions? If they ask him to believe because the Bible says so, that would be presuming he is already a believer. The Bible is a guide and comforter to all believers, but we Christians, who do believe it, must realize that a man must first believe before the Bible is more to him than any other book. He may even believe it all a fable. No where *in the Bible* does our Saviour refer in any way *to the Bible* as we have it. Then what assurance, what evidence can these denominations offer to this seeker? He will not believe the Bible any more than he believes them, unless he has some authority for the Bible. These various bodies deny any Apostolic succession or authority here on the earth now. They assert their equal authority with the historic Church and often claim to be purer, more reformed, more spiritual, less worldly. What is the man to do or believe? The Jew, as quoted in the first chapter, has answered their claims, and the man probably follows the example of the Jew—disbelieves.

There are doubtless millions of such men and women, who could be made earnest, zealous, pious believers if all Christians were once more united in the original, historic Church, the Church that reaches back step by step, age by age, to the Apostles and our Saviour Himself, or, if all Christians recognized the same Apostolic succession and authority that was with the Church at first, and which was unquestioned for fifteen

hundred long years, and which was our Saviour's own chosen way.

And just in this way the greatest harm is being done the Christian cause by Christians themselves. Denying, decrying and ridiculing the doctrine of any organized succession from the Apostles, thus weakening the authority of His own chosen witnesses and offering no certain anchorage themselves, and reaching the ears of so many millions on an equality with the historic Church, they undermine the faith while feeling they are serving Him.

The Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth, pastor of the First Congregational Church, New Haven, in his Christmas sermon, had these significant words to say:

"Another age is at hand. The signs of it are written also across the failure of this Protestant age. I am not saying that its failures in any direction are complete. They may be summed up in this judgment, that the Protestant faith is losing mastery over the controlling forces of modern life. This is apparent to some extent in all spheres of life. For one thing, Protestantism has lost the old authority of the Church. It has lost it in its own families. Protestantism has lost the voice of authority also in the state; our churches, as churches, are not accounted to be political powers. More than this, Protestantism as organized; or, rather, as it is disorganized in our churches, has lost control over large areas of religious thought. It is not merely that worldliness is coming in, but much religion is withdrawing itself from our churches.

"Protestantism has lost power to give to the people a good religious education. It is not meeting much re-

ligious thought and questioning among its own children. There are many of our best young men who, religiously to-day, are very much in the position in which, when in Constantinople, I heard a traveler was left. After the arrival of his vessel he was put in a boat and sent ashore. But the Turkish officials at the landing found something wrong in his papers and sent him back to the ship. The officials of the ship refused to receive him, because he had not papers authorizing him to embark. And the story left him passing to and fro between the ship and the shore, with no power to rest either on land or in the ship. Such is the religious state of many minds. Protestantism does not attract them, and Rome repels them.

"With all this, Protestantism has utterly lost the unity of the Church. The Roman Church once was as a strong cable, one end of which was bound to the Eternal Power, and the other end of which was fastened firmly to the whole mechanism of human life. It controlled the world, and moved it whither it would. In Protestantism, the rope on its human end has frayed out into so many threads. No single strand of it is strong enough to move the whole social mechanism; it is like so many ramblings; at best, one thread may move a few wheels. I am not speaking of the causes for this; I am facing the facts. What do they mean? What is the significance of the failure of the ages of Protestantism but this—the new age is coming? 'I see,' said the last Bampton lecturer in the pulpit of St. Mary's, at Oxford, 'the signs of a new religious order, the greatest that the world has known, drawn from all the nations and all classes, and, what seems stranger yet,

from all churches.' Is that true? * * * * * *

"One is the growth of a common Christian consciousness. For us now no one church, no single church in existence is big enough to hold a big Christian man. Another sign of the coming Protestant Catholicism is the recovery among us of the truth of the Christian society, the one, continuous Christian society. This is the real Apostolic succession, that of the one unbroken life through all the years of the Christian society which the Lord first gathered around Himself.

"With this recovery of the sense of the unity of the one historic and continuous Christian communion may be recognized likewise a greater spiritual authority and working control of the forces of life. Growing out of this there is an increasing and often eager readiness for larger reconstruction of our churches. These two movements within the Roman Church, and among the Protestant churches, have a vast deal in common—they may in the new order meet and match and complete each other; then the ages of papal absolutism and of Protestant individualism shall end in the new order in which Christianity shall find still greater fulfilment. We ought to live and work in the expectation of the Christ; we should hold our own fidelities in the larger loyalty of the greater faith. Our children shall see a greater realization of the life of the Christ on the earth than our eyes may be permitted to behold."

This book is a plea for unity! Can it come in any Protestant denomination, in a compromise with all of them or under the Protestant conception at all? If it cannot, does it not behoove every Christian of every name or communion in answer to our Saviour's prayer

and the Apostles' pleadings and warnings, to "let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you with all malice" (Eph. iv. 31) and endeavor to heal these divisions, to return to the Church of the ages and help her hold always and forever until the end of the world that faith that St. Jude tells us to contend for "in the Unity of the Spirit and bond of peace."

THE MAIN DIFFERENCES OF OPINION BETWEEN CHRISTIANS.

There are many peculiar ideas and opinions that have caused Protestant Christians to separate from the Historic Church and from each other when once the habit was formed. Such little differences as cause the division of Christians into hundreds of sects like Missionary Baptists, Free Will Baptists, Primitive Baptists, Feetwashing Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Lutherans, Moravians, Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Protestant, Wesleyan Methodist, Methodist New Connection and other division of Methodists, United Brethren, Presbyterians of many names, Holiness sect, Dowieites, Christian Science, etc.

Many of them are separated simply because of incompatibility without there being any real difference at all. But the main subjects that the various denominations have emphasized and stressed so much as reasons for

their separate existence until they have come to regard them as more important than the Bible pleading for unity, are:

Mode of Baptism—Immersion and Affusion.
Infant Baptism,
Predestination and Election,
Church Government,

and in considering these subjects, if we can find no good reasons for separation because of them, and we can eliminate them, then the smaller and minor differences would hardly be of sufficient importance to stand in the way of unity.

CHAPTER III.

The Mode of Baptism—Immersion and Affusion.

There are several bodies of Christian people separated from the Historic Church on account of the mode of baptism, who hold and teach immersion as the only proper mode of baptism, and accuse those Christians who baptize by affusion, as well as by immersion, of perverting the Bible.

Our own observation is, that the great majority of these Christians hold this view not so much from conviction as the result of their own investigation, but because their association and their environment are such that, holding this view becomes to them a matter of course, and it never occurs to them that the other view has any support at all.

Our aim in this article is not to argue *against immersion* as a mode of baptism, because immersion is one mode of baptism, but to show that holding immersion as the mode does not necessitate separate and rival organizations to promulgate this opinion; that it is not necessary to have and keep up separate societies, to divide up the household of faith just because men differ on such matters—because one man believes in immersion and another in affusion as the mode of baptism. It is not *against immersion as a mode of baptism* we are pleading, because the Church holds immersion as valid baptism, but against the *undue stress* laid on this mode; against such undue stress as to separate Christians from the Historic

Church in face of the Bible warning. All can and do agree on *baptism*. Why in the world then, should some separate themselves in order to be baptized by immersion, and others by affusion, when the Church Catholic, looking to the sacrament itself, and not the mode, as the essential feature, allows full liberty, in this as in all other non-essentials or alternatives.

The various meanings of the word that is translated baptism in the New Testament have been written about, talked about, argued about, quarrelled about, have caused controversy after controversy, and still those who want it translated only as dip or immerse can see no other meaning for it and the others will not agree to confining it to those meanings only. There was a newspaper item a short time back which stated that a religious body had threatened to boycott the publications of the American Bible Society if they did not translate this word *dip* in their Bibles. We do not know that this is true. It was a news item, but it shows how far people will go to have their way.

We are afraid we shall fail, as others have failed before us, to turn our immersionist brethren away from their narrow view of the Christian religion which limits church membership to immersed people, into the broader, more Catholic, more beautiful view of the Church, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, that allows every child of God who earnestly and honestly desires to serve Him to come therein, whether he or she believes in affusion or immersion, so long as they are humble enough to receive the ministrations of those who are sent to them in the name of the Lord. As a part of our efforts, however, of stirring

up some serious thoughts about the unity of Christians, we ask a careful consideration of the following argument against—not immersion as a mode of baptism but—such undue stress on the *mode* that makes men lose sight of that for which the sacrament itself stands.

Let us see if this is a matter of such importance as to warrant a separate organization to teach it; of sufficient importance as to warrant the setting at naught our Saviour's prayer that we may all be one.

All through the Old Testament in all the religious ceremonies of the old dispensation the mode of cleansing from impurities is by sprinkling. We do not take time to quote the passages. The Old Testament is full of them. The prophet Ezekiel, foretelling Christ, says: (Chap. xxxvi. 25), "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you."

The Eunuch, whom Philip Baptized, was reading a passage from Isaiah lii. 15, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." All through the Old Testament the cleansing from impurities representing and corresponding to the sacrament of baptism was by sprinkling. Now remember that the Old Testament was all the Scriptures they had then, and remember, too, that all the Apostles, disciples and John the Baptist were Jews. Do you not think it would have taken explicit instructions to change a custom so well known and universal?

Three thousand were baptized at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. There is no river there, and as the

laws forbade the Jews using the public pools, it is not to be supposed that the Christians, then despised and persecuted, would be allowed to use them. How were these three thousand baptized? By immersion or by affusion? You have to imagine a good deal to make it immersion. It could have been by affusion without any stretch of imagination.

St. Paul had been without anything to eat for three days and nights (Acts ix. 9), and yet we read in verses 18-19, "and immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. And when he had received meat he was strengthened." Is it conceivable that Ananias took St. Paul, who had had nothing to eat for three days and nights, and immersed him before he had anything to eat? Immerse him, a man in that weak condition, have him change his clothing and after all this give him to eat! It would have taken some time and exertion to seek a suitable place to immerse him beside the exposure to a man so long without nourishment. I ask in all sincerity is this conceivable? "He arose and was baptized"! how simple that reads, and yet the difference of opinion as to that ceremony has caused strife and divisions among the children of God. "He arose and was baptized," a man three days and nights without food! Does it not seem so plain that he was baptized right there in the room where he was? "He arose and was baptized!" Was it performed by immersion or by affusion?

St. Peter preached to Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends (Acts x. 24), and as he was finishing his sermon (Acts x. 47-48), he asks "Can any man forbid

water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we"? "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." "Can any man forbid water"! A strange expression if it was his intention or practice to take them to some stream or pool and immerse them, but a very natural one if all he wanted was a cup of water with which to baptize them.

"And he (the jailor) took them (Paul and Barnabas) the same hour of the night and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his, straightway (Acts xvi. 33), "And when it was day the magistrates sent the sergeants saying, let those men go * * * but Paul said unto them, they have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison and now do they thrust us out privily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." (Acts xvi. 35-37.) "And he took them the same hour of the night * * * and was baptized he and all his, straightway." Were they immersed? Where? There were hardly pools in prisons in those days. There are none now and there are far more comforts now than then. Did St. Paul take them "the same hour of the night" out of prison down to the river and wade out and immerse them and then go back to prison all in their dripping clothes, all in the dark hours of the night; and then, after having already been out, would St. Paul tell the sergeants the next morning they would not leave the prison until the magistrates let them go publicly. Would St. Paul leave the prison and then go back the previous night, and then next morning tell the magistrates he would not go until they let him out openly? This

would be a grand-stand play to the galleries unworthy a common play actor and inconceivable in a man of St. Paul's earnest, straightforward character. Does it not seem so plain that they were baptized by affusion right there in the prison?

Immersion requires some fore-knowledge of the time of ceremony, some previous intention in order to make preparation. It requires change of apparel. Man's physical needs were the same then as now. It would have been as dangerous for him to remain long in wet, dripping clothes then as now. Still, in all the recorded ceremonies of baptism there is no mention of any preparation for the ceremony, no suggestion or hint or even remotest reference to any change of clothes or any preparation of any kind that would necessarily go with immersion. Multitudes were baptized by John the Baptist; our Saviour was baptized and much detail is given, but there is no hint or reference to any change of apparel. Three thousand were baptized on the day of Pentecost, and as this was the first sermon ever preached in the Church, these three thousand could hardly have left home intending to be baptized, and so could not have been prepared for immersion. When St. Paul was on his way to Damascus it was to persecute the Christians, and therefore he was not expecting to be baptized, and hence he was certainly not prepared for immersion. Was he immersed without previous preparation, and did he then change his clothes, all before he broke his three days' fast? Cornelius and his friends and kinsmen were baptized, and as this was the first time salvation was preached to Gentiles, they hardly left home expecting to be baptized, and therefore it is not to be imagined

they went prepared for immersion; the jailor and his household, Lydia and her household were baptized without mention of any preparation for immersion. The Eunuch was met by Philip accidentally, was baptized by him, and Philip was immediately caught away. The Eunuch was not expecting to be baptized when he left home and was baptized right then and there on the journey, and Philip left immediately, and no preparation for immersion is mentioned for either of them.

Of course, if immersion was the only and proper mode of baptism, the fact of there being no mention of any preparation or reference to change of clothes or any of the usual routine incident to immersion would not be evidence against it. There could have been immersion without such detail being given, but it hardly seems probable that in all these and other recorded baptisms there should be not the least hint or suggestion of any preparation of any kind, to say nothing of the innumerable circumstances that argue against immersion as the sole mode; and if you have not already made up your mind—if you are not prejudiced—this certainly *seems* to be a stronger argument for affusion than immersion.

Of course, the three thousand on day of Pentecost *could* have been immersed; St. Paul *could* have been immersed; Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends *could* have been immersed. The jailor and his household *could* have been immersed. The Eunuch *could* have been immersed. Everything is possible with God. He *could* have warned both Philip and the Eunuch, the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, the jailer and

his household, Cornelius and his friends to prepare for immersion. He *could* have arranged for St. Paul to bear the exposure of immersion without food. The Almighty Omnipotent God *could* have done all these things, but the Bible, His inspired word, does not so record His doing. These records from His sacred word *almost* preclude the possibility of immersion in these baptisms. The Bible certainly does not say they were *immersed.* It says they were baptized. You must certainly add to or change the sacred scriptures to make immersion the mode of baptism in these cases. And if you are not going to add to or change these sacred records, but leave them just as they are, then these cases of baptisms at least must have been by affusion.

The word *Baptizo* is the word translated *baptize,* and if this word meant, inflexibly and unchangeably, to dip or immerse or plunge, the circumstances connected with the cases of recorded baptism just noted would be hard to reconcile. The word really has many meanings in English, all equally attaching to it and the circumstances in which it is used must indicate which English word it must be translated into. It means to *dye,* to *wet,* to *wash,* to *cleanse,* to *dip.* In Daniel iv., 33, it is translated *wet* in the following sentence, "And he was *wet* with the dew of Heaven." In St. Mark vii. 4, it is translated *wash* and *washing* in the sentence, "When they come from the market except they *wash they* eat not, and many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the *washing* of cups and pots and brazen vessels and of tables." They certainly did not immerse themselves every time they came from the market nor did they immerse their tables, and yet

this would be what this means if this is the only translation for *baptizo*.

There are some records of baptism, that, to a mind already prejudiced in favor of immersion, would tend to confirm this opinion. Such as "and were baptized of Him in Jordan" (Mat. iii. 6). "And Jesus when He was baptized went up straightway out of the water" (Matt. iv. 16). "And they went down both into the water both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him, and when they were come up out of the water" (Acts ix. 38-39). "And John also was baptizing in Aenon because there was much water there." (John iii. 23), and that metaphor St. Paul uses in Romans vi. and Colossians ii.: "We are buried with Him in baptism." These passages, as stated, would indicate immersion to a mind already bent that way and we are willing to allow they were by immersion. *They are equally applicable to affusion however.* These are the only expressions that are reconcilable with immersion, but they are also equally consistent with affusion. The other baptisms already mentioned are *reconcilable only with affusion,* while almost absolutely precluding immersion. So far as the mode is concerned, we feel sure both modes were practiced then as now, and that one does not antedate the other. If, however, the Sacrament is to be confined to only one mode, the evidence largely supports affusion.

"And were baptized of him in Jordan." Does this mean *immersed* in Jordan? If it does, then "John did baptize in the wilderness" (Mark i., 4), means *immersed* in the sands of the wilderness. The very same preposition *en* is used for both these passages. This same preposition is translated *at* in Matt. viii. 6. "My

servant lieth *at* home sick of the palsy," and translated thus in the sentence Matt. iii., 6, would read "And were baptized of him *at* Jordan." This preposition really has ten meanings, and in St. Matthew it is variously translated as the context requires, *in, on, at, with, by, for, among, through, into, because of*. It has no fixed meaning in any *one* English word. How then can it mean absolutely in the phrase, "baptized of him in Jordan," that they were immersed any more than that they were baptized by affusion.

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water" does not necessarily mean that he was immersed before he went up out of the water. He could just as easily have been baptized by affusion and then went up out of the water. The "out of" does not indicate immersion any more than it does affusion. There are pictures of our Lord's baptism in existence now, we are told, made in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries. These all represent His baptism by affusion—not one is by immersion. They represent our Saviour and John the Baptist, both standing with their bare feet just a step or two in the shallow water of Jordan, and John the Baptist baptizing Jesus by pouring water on His head out of a shell. It could hardly be that the authors of these illustrations misrepresented this scene, which was so well known in those days. They are a far stronger argument that our Lord was thus baptized than any man's opinion one way or the other in these days.

"And they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him, and when they were come up out of the water," etc.

Does this mean necessarily that Philip immersed the Eunuch. Could he not just as easily have baptized him by affusion and then come up out of the water. If *into* means *immersion,* then both must have been immersed, because both went down *into* the water and both came up *out of* the water.

"Into" may mean, and we believe it does, that they went down into some small stream, or branch, and after the baptizing they came up out of it. The Greek word *eis,* which is here translated "into," is the very same word that is translated *"to"* in the phrases, "Go (*eis*) to the sea and cast a hook." "The other disciple did outrun Peter and came first (*eis*) to the sepulchre but went not in." "He went (*eis*) to Jerusalem." If *into* is the only meaning for this word *eis,* the sentence above quoted would read as follows: "The other disciple did outrun Peter and came first *into* the sepulchre but went not in." What sense would that make? Yet this is the same word that is used in the phrase "they went down *into* the water." This could be just as correctly translated—"They went down *to* the water." So with the word *ek,* which is translated "out of." This word is used sixty-five times in Acts of the Apostles and translated *out of* only five times; and though used one hundred and nine times in St. Matthew, is only translated *out of* ten times. How then can it mean immersion any more than it can mean affusion?

There is one very important circumstance connected with this baptism of the Eunuch that almost precludes immersion, besides the fact that they were hardly prepared for immersion. It is this: The route traveled by the Eunuch and Philip is well known, and it has

been said that no traveler has ever yet discovered any river or stream or indication of one along this route.

"Buried with Him in baptism" is insisted on to mean immersion, signified by the covering up of the dead body, which is afterward raised, thus typifying immersion. St. Paul is here and in the corollary metaphor in 2nd Chap. Coll. trying to impress, not the *mode* of baptism, but, the *fact* of baptism, and especially that spiritual factor in the sacrament which separates us as by death from carnal things and implants in us the ability to love spiritual things. It is a terrible bringing down of a high order of thought.

If St. Paul was trying to impress the *mode* of baptism, rather than *what baptism represents,* then he took an unfortunate example for immersion, because our Saviour laid in a tomb *above the ground,* and a rock was rolled against the opening to the sepulchre. "When Peter came to the sepulchre he *stooped and looked in,* and the other disciples went to the sepulchre but went not in." If immersion was meant to be typified, His body would have been covered with earth and Peter would not have had to stoop to look in, nor would there be any use to roll a stone to the door.

Says Dr. Powers: "In this connection the laws and customs of those days made a legal burial of a person the sprinkling of three handfuls of earth on the dead body." The Athenian law imperatively ordered the finder of an unburied dead body to cast three handfuls of earth on it (Aelian v. 14). In the Odyssey (See xi. 66-78), especially the 75th line, the poet says:

"*Pour* a tomb for me upon the shore of the hoary sea" and the Antigone of Sophocles turns upon the suffi-

ciency of three handfuls of earth to constitute a legal burial. And Virgil in the Aeneid (vi., 365-373), Cicero (De Legabus iii.) and Horace in his Odes (I. 28, I. 36), give us accounts of the fact and practice of this law and custom in the Roman empire in those days. And Ramsey (in his manual of Roman antiquities, page 427), says, "Any one who chances to find an unburied corpse, although it were that of a stranger, was held to be guilty of impiety if he did not perform the rite of sepulture in their most simple shape, by thrice casting a handful of earth on the remains." Therefore, if the Colossians and Romans had understood St. Paul to refer to the *mode* of baptism in these metaphors they could only have understood him to mean "sprinkled with Him in baptism." They could not possibly have understood him to mean "immersed with Him in baptism."

"If immersion be the only proper mode of administering the sacrament of baptism, there can hardly be any baptized people in the Arctic and Antarctic circles, nor on the deserts, nor on the great American plains. By this method the sacrament can only rarely, if ever, be administered there; and if the Church is to limit her membership only to immersed people, then there must be a large number of people who can never be members of the church, people who can never be baptized Christians. No sick person can be baptized by this method, and however much he may desire it, if death ensue, he must die unbaptized. It is not possible that our Lord instituted a sacrament to any extent exclusive, or gave His Apostles instructions they could not possibly obey, and you know he charged them to bap-

tize all nations. He did not except the people who live in the frozen regions, in the deserts and plains and all the sick. If baptism be necessary and immersion be the only mode, Christianity is forbidden to a large number of people." (*"Why Not, and Why."*)

"I indeed baptize you with water * * * but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. iii. 11.) "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i., 5.) These expressions are inconsistent with immersion because, "Baptize with water" means the application of water to the person; immersion means the application of the person to the water. If Baptism is immersion only, then you would not say baptized *with* water. You would say baptized *in* water.

Our immersionist brethren are so used to those certain passages from the Bible that we noted as, on their face, seemingly to support immersion, and have heard them stressed and emphasized so much, and are so satisfied they are right and are so given to ridiculing at least in their own minds the other position that they have lost sight entirely of all the Biblical quotations and authority that support the other view of baptism.

Immersion is a ceremony that, while performed by the minister and received by the person as a solemn ceremony, is nevertheless a matter of curiosity and comment to the idle-minded. It has a somewhat pharasaical appearance to some. The sacrament administered by pouring in the name of the Blessed Trinity is beautiful in its very simplicity.

But! after all is said and done, after all this controversy and insistence on immersion, after our

brethren have separated and divided up just to emphasize this opinion of theirs, they still say that baptism is not essential to salvation; that because they do not believe it is essential they do not consider it necessary to practice any "substitute" as they call it—meaning that baptism and immersion are synonymous, and any other method of administering it is only a substitute; that, holding baptism to be only a badge, a uniform in which to fight for Christ as a soldier wears his uniform; that, as the uniform does not make the soldier, neither does baptism make the Christian; holding it to be only an initiatory rite into their communions and not essential to salvation, they do not consider it necessary to administer it to sick people, to people in deserts and frozen countries, and that these can get along just as well without baptism, living or dying.

Our Saviour did not say this. He said baptize all nations, and we do not see how man can change this and do just as he pleases, baptizing where he pleases and refusing it where he pleases.

If baptism is not an essential feature in the plan of salvation, but only a badge or uniform to put on or leave off as one pleases, it would be difficult to understand such quotations as these:

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.)

"Even baptism doth now save us." I Pet. iii. 21. "He saved us by the washing (*baptism*) of regeneration." (Titus iii. 5.)

"Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins." (Acts xxii. 16.)

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 27.)

"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death, therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 3-4.)

"Jesus answered, verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.)

And the very first sermon that was ever preached was by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost in which his doctrine was:

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins.*" (Acts ii. 38.)

Now in all courtesy, in all charity, pray tell us why St. Peter should preach baptism for the remission of sins if it was not for the remission of sins? St. Peter says it was, and he preached it too immediately after having spent forty days with Jesus listening to the things pertaining to the Kingdom of Heaven. Who dare say baptism is not for the remission of sins when St. Peter and the Bible say it is. It does not matter how much individuals and Christian denominations may think and feel that baptism is not necessary—no matter how objectionable Baptismal regeneration may seem to them—the Bible says *Baptism is for the remission of sins.* This is not *our* construction of it. It is the plain letter of the Bible that says so. It is just as much harm to take from the Bible as it is to add to it, and if baptism

is for the remission of sins it occupies a far higher place in the plan of salvation than simply a badge or uniform.

If these passages do not mean that baptism is a saving sacrament, then what do they mean? And let me ask it seriously and solemnly and may you so regard the question: If these do mean that our Saviour did institute this sacrament to have a real saving part in His plan of salvation, what is to become of those who are responsible for sick people and people in deserts and frozen countries and children who have not "been baptized into His death" and so cannot "walk in newness of life"? Would it not be safer, to say the least, to act on the theory, that *it is* essential, because then we would have both chances; if it *is* essential we would have done our duty by all nations. If it be not essential we have certainly done no harm.

And if baptism be not essential to salvation, if it be only a rite or ceremony, a badge or uniform, how can our brethren defend their continued separation from the others of God's children? If *baptism itself* be not essential, why should the *method of administering* it prevent the fulfillment of St. Paul's pleading and our Saviour's Prayer? *If the ceremony itself, if baptism itself be not essential, how can the way in which it is administered be so important?* If a thing itself is not important, how can the way in which that thing is done be important? Why let a ceremony that can be safely performed or left undone stand in the way of holding the faith in the unity of the spirit and bond of peace? The Unity of Christians is surely very important, when the Bible is so full of pleadings for

it and warnings against division, and that too when our Saviour Himself prayed that we might be one in order that the world might believe in Him. If unity is so necessary and important, and if baptism be not essential, why make it more important than unity? If there be no necessary or essential cause for these separations, if they only result from the notions and opinions and self-will of human beings, then, in the face of the Apostles' pleading and our Saviour's prayer, these separations are high crimes and treason against God.

CHAPTER IV.

Infant Baptism.

Why should Christians separate from the Historic Church into other religious organizations because she teaches and practices the baptism of infants and little children? Why should those who do not wish to baptize their children separate from those who do? Those who feel that this is an important part of the Apostles' practice and teaching would be deprived of this privilege in a body who would not allow it; while those who do not wish their children baptized could remain in the Church without sacrifice because they would not be forced to do this in order to remain in the Church; and if they can fellowship in union meetings and exchange of pulpits, etc., with their brother Christians who do baptize their children; if they look on them as Christians at all, why should they have a separate organization contrary to the Bible pleadings? If those Christians who do want their children baptized *are* Christians, why should they not be members in the same church with those who do not?

In the Old Testament and dispensation children were made members of the church at eight days old. This was by direct command of God Almighty, and failure to do this had brought down His wrath on the offenders. The Jewish people were so accustomed to this, it was such an important part of their daily life, so thoroughly ingrained in their very nature that they could not have understood a church, or system, or

dispensation that did not take in the children. Our Saviour was a Jew, born in the Jewish nation, His twelve apostles were all Jews, all his disciples, until Cornelius, were Jews. From the days of Abraham to the 16th century, when some Christians made this a cause of separation, children were made members of the Church without other thought or comment save that it was by divine command. Would it not have taken the clearest and most positive and explicit instructions for the discontinuance of so universal a custom? And is not the very absence of this command, in face of such a custom, all the proof necessary that the custom continued in the new dispensation only by baptism instead of circumcision?

The change in the character of initiation is noted, but there is nothing said of any change as to whom it should be administered.

In view of this custom so well known and followed, would we not rather look in the New Testament for instructions for its discontinuance rather than its inauguration?

Instead of its *being* an adding to the Bible requirements, to baptize children, is it not really a *taking from* them, to discontinue a custom and sacrament which the Bible most certainly enjoins? We do not need a direct command to continue a practice to which we have been accustomed to from time immemorial. We would rather expect a command to discontinue. We keep Sunday in the Christian dispensation as the day of rest, instead of the Sabbath, as did the old Jewish dispensation. We admit women to communion. There is no express command to do

these. Does not the baptism of children come nearer being expressly commanded than either of these customs of the church? Why should infant baptism, which is warranted by the Scriptures, being the Christian fulfillment of the Jewish rite of circumcision, be so condemned by Christians who engage in these other practices about which the Bible is silent? We are not finding fault with these other customs, but the authority for them is certainly from some other source than the Bible, and the same Church that made our present Sunday and first administered the communion to women has always taken the children into the church by baptism. Why fault one and not the other?

There is certainly nothing in the Bible said *against* the practice and custom of taking in the children, and this is all the authority we should want that the custom continued. And, when the jailor and all his house, and Lydia and her household were baptized, and when St. Paul writes of his baptizing Stephanus and his household, and there is nothing said about leaving out the children, it rather looks like the custom continued without any interruption. Who were the households of Lydia, the jailer and Stephanus, if there were no children?

They tell us there is no proof there *were any* children, but where is the proof that there *were not* children. Did the inspired writers select three *households* especially without children and still not so tell us?

Here we have a well-known custom—here we have three households; must *we prove* infant baptism and prove there were children, or is the burden on those who would abolish this well-known custom, and in

support of their position suggest that these three households had no children?

The reason nearly always given for objecting to infant baptism, is that repentance and faith come before baptism; that John preached the baptism of repentance, and that our Saviour's words were, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and that as a child cannot repent and cannot believe he should not be baptized.

Shall we take this cold hard view of our duty when there is so much, so very much in favor of taking the little children into the Church with us? Shall we in the Church enjoy her privileges and have her protecting arms around us to help us in our battle with life, while we leave our little children out of the fold to find their own way and perhaps have them stay out forever!

Our Saviour told His disciples to feed His lambs as well as His sheep. Shall we have a fold composed of only sheep? If there be only one fold and one Shepherd, must not that fold include the lambs?

If "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" means that baptism is dependent on belief; that no person shall be baptized unless he believes, then it also means that all who do not believe and are not baptized shall be damned, for the whole sentence is this: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." If this means that only believers shall be baptized it equally means that only believers shall

be saved. Then what becomes of little children who cannot believe, of idiots and simpletons who cannot believe?

It expressly says that those who believe not shall be damned. It rather seems to the writer that this either proves too much or it is the strongest argument to baptize all people including the children.

Could it not more reasonably be construed to mean that belief and baptism are independent words, and that he who believeth is saved, and he who is baptized shall be saved, while he who believes not shall be damned—i. e., that he who disbelieves, refuses to believe, rejects consciously the faith, shall be damned.

In the very first sermon that was ever preached in the Christian Church, St. Peter said: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, for the promise is to you and to your children." Why should he mention children at all in a sentence like this when he is telling them to be baptized for the remission of sins? If it be wrong to baptize them, why should he mention them at all; what sense is there in such an expression, if it has no bearing on the baptism of children? It does seem so plain that he had no other idea in the world than that the children should be brought into His Church, as he had always known them to be, only by baptism instead of circumcision.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you" was addressed to grown people who were not Christians; the same call is still made to-day, and has always been made and always will be made as long as there is a soul left out of the Kingdom; but when once we are

Christians and in the fold then the remainder of St. Peter's words ring in our ears "for the promise is unto you and your children."

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" is the call to the unconverted adult—"for the promise is to you and your children," is the privilege you enjoy when you have yourself accepted the call. Will you not also avail yourself of this privilege for your children as well as for yourself, or will you "neglect so great salvation" and allow them to reach that stage in life when only the adult message can be addressed to them, perhaps in vain? "For the promise is to you and your children;" shall you only avail *yourself* of the promise and leave your children out?

If the plea be that repentance must come before baptism, and for this reason only those who can repent can be baptized, then one of two things are before us. Repentance is just one *act* followed by baptism or it is a state of existence continuing all the balance of life, and in this case then we must be continually baptizing every time we repent.

Repentance is not one single act fitting one just for baptism and then ceasing. The Christian is always repenting all his life long. It is a continual state, and thus baptism cannot be dependent and contingent always on repentance.

As Bishop Thompson says: "The youngest acolyte commences his Christian experience with repentance, and the oldest Bishop, gray in the Christian service, professes repentance with the Palms and the Cross before his dying eyes."

And when considering repentance in connection with baptism, and the usual emphasis put on John the Baptist's requiring fruits meet for repentance, before he would baptize, it must be remembered this was before the Church was organized under our Saviour's instruction, and that after this was done Christian baptism was a different baptism from John's baptism. Christian baptism is in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. There was no Holy Ghost in John's baptism. Turn to Acts xviii. 24-26, xix. 1-5. "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the spirit he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism of John.* And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue; whom, when Aquilla and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them and *expounded the way of God more perfectly.*" * * * "And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said *unto John's baptism.* Then said Paul unto them, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this *they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.*"

This shows very plainly that John's baptism of repentance cannot be quoted as a reason for refusing baptism to children because they cannot repent. The sacrament of Christian baptism is something more than John's baptism of repentance.

"And they brought young children unto Him that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it He was much displeased, and saith unto them, suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not for of such is the Kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them and blessed them." Mark x., 13-16, and the same language is also recorded in Luke xviii. 15-17, except the first sentence which reads, "And they brought unto Him also infants," etc.

"Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Mat. xviii., 3.

"Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones, it were better he had a millstone about his neck." Mark ix., 42.

"And He took a little child and set him in the midst of them, and when He had taken him in His arms, He said unto them, whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name receiveth me." Mark ix., 36.

These are some of our Saviour's blessed words regarding little children.

If we bring our little children to Him now, shall His disciples again rebuke us as in the former days? And does it not displease our Saviour as much now

as then? And can we not hear again His gentle voice saying, "forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God."

Our Saviour's prayer was that we should be one that the world might believe. St. Paul pleaded for us to strive together for the faith of the Gospel, and beseeches us to be perfectly joined together and have no division. Can this be done if our brethren will remain away from us because we bring our little children to Him? We would not force them to do so if they do not wish to, and they certainly ought not to remain away from us because some of us feel this is the divine way.

To sum up the whole argument, *there is no part or portion of the Bible anywhere that forbids or disapproves infant baptism.* There is on the other hand the universal custom of the Jewish Church so well grounded in their national and spiritual relations that they could not have understood a dispensation that did not take in the children, and which would have required a specific command for its discontinuance rather than its inauguration, especially when in II. Thess. 11-15, the apostle admonishes, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught whether by word or our epistle." There is the command to "go baptize all nations" *without excepting the children.* There is our Saviour's blessed invitation, "suffer little children to come unto me," and direction to "forbid them not"; and his dire warning against offending them. There is St. Peter's sermon, in which he told his hearers that "baptism was for the remission of sins and that the promise was for them

and their children." There is the baptism of the jailor and his household, Lydia and her household and Stephanus and his household without excepting the children. And we have the universal practice of the Church from the beginning, while the only organized objection to this part of the Church's teaching is less than three hundred years old.

If baptism, after all, is not essential, but only a badge or uniform, what possible harm can it be to administer it to little children; and as suggested in the previous chapter in regard to immersion, is it not the safest way, in any case, to baptize all little children? Because, if we do baptize them, and baptism should not be essential or necessary, no harm would be done; whereas, if we do not baptize them, and baptism should be essential and a part of the covenant, and if our Saviour intended the children to be taken in the Church, what a grievous wrong, what an irreparable injury we have done!

These things, dear brethren, are worth thinking about. Lay aside all prejudice, all envy, all strife, all controversy and "search the Scriptures for therein ye think ye have eternal life."

CHAPTER V.

Predestination and Election.

"For whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son that He might be the first born among many brethren; moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified." Rom. viii. 29-30. "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand not of works but of Him that calleth, it was said unto her the elder shall serve the younger." Rom. ix. 11-12.

"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." John iii. 16.

"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15-16.

"And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto His people." Exodus xxxii. 14.

"If that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." Jer. xviii. 8.

"And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth and it grieved Him at His heart." Gen. vi. 6.

Every Christian must believe in Predestination as one of the prerogatives of God. We know He is All in All and above all, that all the worlds, the sun, moon and stars, the earth, the sea and all that therein is are His handiwork. We know that with Him a thousand

years are as one day and one day as a thousand years; that He is infinite, all wise, all good, incomprehensible, Creator of all things, Judge of all men. We cannot and ought not, with our finite understanding, presume to measure God's dealings with man. He foreknew all things and still could be blind to all things. He predestinates those that are to be conformed to the image of His Son, and still leaves man to work out his own salvation. He foreordains and still leaves affairs of the world in men's hands—foreknew, predestinated and foreordained all things, and still man is his own free agent to do as he will, to exercise his own free will. His decrees are immutable and unchangeable, and still He repents time and time again, changes His mind and intention and plans. No words can measure or limit or express what He is or is not, what He has done or will do or leave undone, what He sees or when He is blind, when He directs or when He withdraws His oversight. He can be present or absent. His powers, His qualities, His attributes are illimitable, unfathomable, incomprehensible, unknowable. The omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent God! King of Kings and Lord of Lords!

How, then, can men excuse or defend their separation from the Historic Church because they believe in God's predestination? Do not all Christians believe this? Is it right to separate because some believe He predestinated certain people to be saved and certain others to be damned, while others believe that He could or did do this and still leave the result with man himself? Because some *limit His* predestination to *their* understanding of the word as defined in the

dictionary, while the Church Catholic considers this as well as His other prerogatives as away and beyond and out of the realm of human ken?

The Westminster confession of faith, which is the presentation of the Predestinarian idea of salvation and on which so many Christians have separated, has in part the following: Chap. III, section 1, says:

"God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." "By the decree of God for the manifestation of His glory some men and angel's are predestinated unto eternal life, and others foreordained to everlasting death" (section 3). "These angels and men, thus predestined and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished" (section 4). The rest of mankind (that is, the non-elect), "God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by and ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, and to the praise of his glorious justice" (section 7).

This theology is what is known as Calvinism, because John Calvin formed the first religious organization, having this as its main central idea.

Shall we poor human beings presume to define God's predestination and limit it to our finite understanding? If we are, then follow it out to its legitimate end, and, torture logic or distort reason as you will, we have fatalism pure and simple. With this as the plan of salvation,

Christ's incarnation, revelation, crucifixion, resurrection, cease to have a meaning. With man's end already fixed beyond recall, why the useless sacrifice of the Son of God? His people become only automatons, with no need of Him, or of knowledge, or of incentive, or of prayer. Reward and punishment, belief or denial are senseless ideas. The results of all actions, of all circumstances, of all conduct, as well as the circumstances themselves, are already fixed; so where, under this plan, does our Saviour's atonement have place? Did God, before the world began, create a heaven, then a hell, then the earth; then create helpless human beings to people the earth, only to remain a little while, then to go, some to heaven, and some to hell, specially created for them, the number to each already determined and not conditioned on what they themselves do or do not do? If so, then surely it was unnecessary to sacrifice His only Son for them. All harmony in the New Testament would be lost and the whole scope of Christian work would go without cause or reason.

Says Dr. Powers: "It is hard to conceive God as these teachings picture Him, and Christ's life condemns this whole doctrine as thus set out as contradictory and illogical. God who is perfect love cannot create pitiful, helpless beings, unavoidably to sin and suffer eternal punishment. To do this He would be an eternal Nero with the worst of human passions.

"Follow this line of theology in its legitimate course, and it proves itself untrue in a "reductio ad absurdum." For if man be predestined to sin, because of the very nature of sin, he cannot sin. Sin implies responsibility, and responsibility necessitates independent will-power.

But predestination, determining an unalterable line of conduct, prevents choice, and so takes away responsibility, and destroys independence of will power. Under any such conditions man has no discretion. He is compelled to sin, cannot help but sin, and therefore really he cannot sin. He has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of his actions. God alone is responsible for the manufacture of a man who must do the wrong he was manufactured to do.

"Again, man destined to righteous life deserves not the slightest commendation for his good conduct; virtue in him is only that of the piston-rod when the steam in the steam-chest sends it on its little journey. God alone deserves the credit due to the making of a man who was made to be moral, and was moral.

"Hopelessly thrust into sin manufactured by God for man's fall, shapen for eternal suffering, in no manner whatever could these miserable automata reflect glory upon God or demonstrate His justice. The glory attributed to God in this theology is the glory of a compassionless tyrant, and the justice consists in the gratification of an all-powerful and unaccountable selfishness. I cannot conceive a glory rising out of filth or reflected from vice, nor a justice portrayed in dealing out intolerable punishment to people specially and helplessly constructed for the crime they commit and the punishment they are therefor assigned.

"Shall God make the animal dumb and punish him for his dumbness, or create man insane and punish him for his insanity? But this is a fair illustration of this doctrine. God, says God in Holy Scripture, is Holiness and Love. But this doctrine teaches that He

makes man for sin and sin for man, and predestines him to an eternal horror. I cannot reconcile the two. The prophet Joel said, as have many others: "Turn unto the Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil"; and St. John says: "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." But the Westminster confession of faith tells us God has made a place of exquisite and eternal torment for man and man for it, the one exactly fitted for a certain number, and the other in unincreasable and undiminishable number made for it. I cannot reconcile the Confession of Faith and the Bible.

"To accept the prime and fundamental doctrine of the Westminster confession of faith without constant dread and uncertainty of a terrible hereafter would require the stoicism of a very prince of stoics. Only a strong, hard mind and a cast-iron determination, such as possessed John Calvin or John Knox, could live in the belief of its teachings, and the only peace possible for a man after a conscientious acceptance of this doctrine would be that which comes from perfect despair."

"In the light of this teaching, examine your own condition. You are charged to love God "with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and yet you do not know but that you, in spite of all you can do, and all you will not do, are awaiting an inevitable, incomparable wretchedness of eternal duration, because of His entirely arbitrary decree made before you were born. I tell you, under such condi-

tions you cannot love God, and until in the great hereafter you ascertain your destiny you cannot even give Him thanks. If you are a thinking man and this theology be true, earth has no peace for you.

"In these teachings, God's Fatherhood disappears, and the mightiness of His Kingship separated from His inseparable Fatherhood is alone seen, painted in the hard features of a perfect tyranny, and we must all wait as the military prisoners await the drawing of lots for the ordered execution. What shall be, a man cannot foresee, and terror, therefore, is the New Testament's gift to him. There is no harmony here with the Bible.

"Admit this doctrine true, and you stultify God, make the Incarnation senseless, contradict the Christ-given object of Christ's life and work and the manifest meaning of His hope-giving words. Man sinks to the level of a toy, and God to a pitiless maker of toys.

"Listen to the words of the compassionate, loving, gentle, merciful Christ, and to those written by holy men inspired of God. "Come unto me, *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," said our Lord; and "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance"; and again, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."

"St. Paul writes Timothy: "This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a *ransom* for *all*." St. John says: "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the right-

eous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world.*" The prophet Ezekiel testifies that God said: "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." St. Peter writes: "The Lord is long-suffering to us-ward, *not willing* that any should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance." And in the Apocalypse, the Book of Revelation, spoken in heaven and heard on earth, it is said: "*Whosoever will,* let him take the water of life freely."

"There is no exclusiveness in these blessed words. They teach us that man lives and dies righteously or wickedly by man's own decree, and not by God's.

"But it is needless to multiply quotations; the Bible is full of like expressions. Its whole tenor is the infinite love of God and Christ, ever revealing the universal Fatherhood of the Almighty, and Christ as the Redeemer, not of a few, but of all who will believe in Him.

"No; love finds its satisfaction in blessing, not in punishing others; in ever giving pleasure and never giving pain. I cannot picture God; I cannot conceive His countenance; but to me He is the good Father, ever wishing to minister and ever ministering to His children. With care born of a Father's love, He watches over all and blesses them. The sweet, unsilenced voice of that great love is Christ, heard in every heart, giving life to every soul, remonstrating, chastening, lifting up, comforting, encouraging, giving peace." (*"Why Not, and Why?"*)

Predestination has always had its place in the

Church, but the Church's conception of God's predestination is far higher than that which limits it to human understanding. St. Augustine, one of the early martyrs of the Church, had strong views on this subject. Christians of all the ages have always felt around them the great mystery of predestination. *That mystery that reconciles God's foreknowledge and predestination with man's free agency.* This is mystery with us, but what is there about God's dealing with man that is not mysterious? I say that Christians have always felt the power and mystery of predestination, but it remained for John Calvin, in the sixteenth century, fifteen hundred years after the Saviour had pronounced His blessed invitation, "Come unto me all ye who labor and I will give you rest;" it remained for John Calvin to understand and explain away this mysterious prerogative of the Great Jehovah and to make His predestination accord with this plain, finite, every-day human view. It remained for him to form the first Christian organization whose creed limited God's predestination to one set course of action, to strip it of all mystery and to teach it as the unalterable and unchangeable decree of God before the world was made, to save certain people to eternal salvation and damn certain others to eternal damnation, with nothing to determine save His arbitrary will.

Is this the faith once for all delivered which St. Jude admonishes us to contend for? It had not been taught before. If it is the true faith where was it lost during all these fifteen hundred years and how is one to know it is the *faith*? Where was it hid all those years, and how did John Calvin know it to be the true faith, and

where was John Calvin's authority to set it forth?

God being omniscient, and the future being with Him as clear as the past—one day being with Him as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day—foreknows just how each man's free choice will be exercised in the face of that sufficient evil and that sufficient grace which is the portion of every man.

Again, as pointed out in the chapter on immersion and infant baptism, is not the safest way to remain in the one Church and not try to explain predestination? Had we not better leave it as one of the mysteries of God beyond human ken? If John Calvin's view is correct, and certain ones are saved and certain ones damned, we have done no harm, we have not changed our fate. If predetermined it will remain fixed—whatsoever we may do or not do—whereas if the plan of salvation holds man responsible for his good or evil conduct; if he is punished for the bad he does and rewarded for the good he does; if man's salvation depends upon himself and the way in which he accepts or rejects the atoning sacrifice of the Son of God; if predestination is only a mysterious part of the plan of salvation, then is there not danger of Calvinism driving men to the other extreme of Universalism, and perhaps finally to utter callousness and disregard of it all? Fatalism is fatal to Christianity?

The Church is large enough for all of both schools of predestination. The man who believes in the absolute, unalterable predestination of some men to salvation and some to damnation can be a member of the

Church along with him who believes it a mystery beyond human piercing. What we claim is, that it is not necessary to have and keep up a separate organization for this purpose. Shall the one say to the other, You cannot be a member of the Church? The Church is God's kingdom on earth—the Kingdom of Heaven. Shall one man be a member of it, then, because he believes a certain way about predestination and another be refused membership because he believes another way?

Did the Apostles have time on the day of Pentecost to obtain from each of the three thousand a relation of their experience and conviction and belief in predestination?

"The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net that has been cast into the sea and *gathered of every kind,* which, when it was full, they drew to shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just." Matt. xiii., 47-49. These are our blessed Saviour's words, and who dare take on himself the right and authority to separate the good from the bad as they are being gathered in that net! The net gathers all, both good and bad, and the separating is done when the net is full at the end of the world by the angels themselves. Who dare separate them here as they are being gathered?

There is no human power that could make us refuse a man membership in His Church, the Kingdom of God on earth. We might be casting away the good!

Let us gather in the fishes without thought as to the good or the bad until, when it is full and drawn to the shore, at the end of the world the angels can sever the good from the bad.

CHAPTER VI.

Church Government.

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19-20.)

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 19; also xviii. 1 and 18.)

"Until the day in which He was taken up, after that He through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom He had chosen." "To whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." (Acts i. 2-3.)

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you and ye shall be witnesses of me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts i. 8.)

We have endeavored to show and we hope we have shown that none of the differences of opinion prevalent among Christians to-day are really barriers to all Christians holding "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"; that for such mere shadows there need be no such separations among Christians as have made Christianity present to the world such a spectacle of uncertainty and indefiniteness and contradiction; that every Christian man or woman or Christian body can,

without the sacrifice of a single essential doctrine or practice or opinion, return to and be one with and within the Historic Church. We say we hope we have shown this; and are the different governments in the various religious bodies any greater barrier than the other differences? Are the different forms of government in different bodies of Christians so important or essential or necessary as to warrant this universal repudiation of the Bible pleadings against division and for unity?

Of what importance to the mission of the Church and of Christianity is the insistence of some Christians on the Presbyterian form of Government and of others on the Congregational form of Government, and the consequent separation of brethren, when in the Historic Church is the government established by the Apostles themselves. "After that He, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments unto the Apostles whom he had chosen"—included in which are the distinctive features of the Presbyterian Government and the Congregational Government, and more!

This brings us to the only thing our separated brethren must give up or concede for the great consummation our Saviour prayed for, "that we all may be one that the world might believe"—only this! their independence from and rivalry to the Old Church, the Church He instituted and His Apostles established; their position and claim to be equal, independent, separate "churches" in the sense in which they now claim to be. Then, naturally, would follow their return to the Church of the ages from which their human founders separated; their loyalty and allegiance to her;

their communion with her and their acknowledgment of her divine authority. This is all that is necessary for unity, and how simple! And how easily this could be done, if we would only be self-denying in the Master's cause! We do not ask them to give up their organization to come into any modern church. We do not ask them to give up theirs for ours. It is not *ours*. It is *theirs* as much as *ours*.

If they would but recognize that the errors and corruption of the Church was no reason for deserting her, and that these could have been more easily corrected, and the lethargy and worldliness and carelessness and selfishness of some of Her Bishops and clergy could have been more easily overcome and remedied, if their founders had done their work of reform *within the Church* instead of in separate rival organizations! If they could but be brought to see that the Papacy, the great Roman heresy, the cause and source of so many errors and corruption, would long ago have given way, if all Christians had been working *inside the Church* instead of working and spending their strength in the several hundred separate and rival bodies! If they could only realize the vast benefit to all mankind, to the Church, to His cause everywhere, that would have resulted, had all the Christian effort that has been wasted in the last four hundred years, and is still being wasted in our divided state, been exerted within the borders of the Church herself, all shoulder to shoulder and pulling the same way.

This giving up, by our separated brethren, of their position and claim as independent rival churches, and their return to the Historic Church, while saving

them from the sin of schism, does not necessitate their giving up their organizations, their ministers, their government or any of their Christian effort. These could all be retained and rendered far more useful by the simple recognition of the Historic Church, the Church of all the Christian ages, as His Church, the Divine institution He established, His body, the Lamb's Bride. And then, their organizations being societies of Christians in and of that Church, existing and working to advance the work and mission of that Church, she would be enabled to speak always, everywhere to all people with one voice and authority! In the Historic Church there have always been these separate societies of Christians, who feel called to different parts of the work; but they recognized the authority of, and were dependent on, and helpful to, the Church, not her rivals.

This plan could be adopted by our separated brethren, and then no matter where we might be, or in whatever religious organization we worked; no matter how various and diverse our opinions, the Church would be the Church everywhere always; and, speaking with one voice, and with one authority, proclaiming "one faith, one Lord and one baptism," "standing fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel," we would indeed "be one and the world would believe."

But while all the various governments could be retained in the several religious organizations as they now exist without injuring her mission, if these bodies be auxiliaries of, instead of rivals to, the Historic Church, it should be plain that in the Church itself there must be

the same authority, the same government as was established by the Apostles themselves, under the direct instructions of our Saviour; the same government and authority that has come down through all the Christian ages, and which must continue on till the end of the world!

It is therefore not *against* the government as such that these religious bodies have made for themselves that we plead, but *for* the recognition of the government and authority of the Historic Church over the Church as a whole, including all Christian bodies.

There was certainly in Apostolic times the one certain definite Church, and this Church continued with the same government, the same authority and with no break in her continuity for fifteen hundred years.

There never was during these fifteen hundred years any body of Christians that did not acknowledge the authority of the Historic Church. There were always the same different opinions on such questions as now perplex Christians, but there was no denial of the Apostolic authority and succession of the Church. The Church was the Church! and while at different times bodies of Christians would separate into different societies for different kinds of Christian work, all of them recognized the government and authority of the Church. There were occasional heresies, but no permanent schism.

It was this same Church, the same divine organization, when Luther and Calvin made the first independent separations from her, as in the time of the Apostles. Errors and corruption had crept into the doctrines and government of certain parts of the Church, some of her clergy had become worldly and

dissolute, but the organization itself, the body corporate of the Church, was the same as it was in the beginning, as it always has been and always will be world without end.

Luther and Calvin and Knox, Brown, Wesley, Williams and Campbell, and all the reformers of former and present times, had the Bible sanction and authority for every effort to drive away from the Church all error, all corruption, all false doctrine and heresy; to condemn the lethargy and worldliness of her clergy; to revive and strengthen their spirituality; but neither they, nor any human being, had any Biblical sanction for the construction anew of organizations separate from, and rivals to, the Church.

There was certainly no warrant or excuse for the errors and abuse and corruption in the Church against which the reformers protested—no excuse whatever—but neither was there any warrant for the building anew, by human beings, of organizations independent of and rivals to the Church. Two wrongs do not make anything right. Because Judas proved traitor would not have justified the dissolution and separation of the other Apostles. Because some bishops and clergy proved unfaithful to their trust, usurped authority and taught error and corruption, does not warrant nor justify the breaking up and separation and desertion of and from the body of the Church which is Christ's Body. Rather should all true Christians have remained in the Church to help drive away those heresies, reform her and lead her back to paths of peace and righteousness. Was or is it possible to correct the errors and corruption *in the Church* by efforts

in separate, rival, unsympathetic organizations? These false efforts have not only failed to correct the evils, but have added to them the sin of schism. It is when nations are torn and rent by internal strife and dissention that they need the advice and support and patriotism of their true citizens. Desertion then would be doubly treason!

Whence come in our times these hundreds of divisions of Christians, of brothers in the household of God, save from the desertion from the Church of some of her best children, and their false efforts to *reform the Church by the construction of new churches?* Whence the heritage of religious anarchy and chaos in our times except from the examples of those early reformers who, in the great religious storm of the Reformation, deserted the Church of all the Christian ages, and endeavoring to build, each for himself, have brought this deluge of religious separation and division on this generation.

Imagine the several States composing the United States having different forms of government—some republican, some absolute and some limited monarchy. Is it conceivable that such various governments could be reconcilable in any one government? Yet this is what is claimed for the Christian nation, the Kingdom of God on earth; that it is composed of various divisions under as widely variant governments as would be the above political governments. Episcopal! Presbyterian! Congregational! The absurdity of expecting the world to believe that the Church which He calls the Kingdom of Heaven is composed of several equal, independent separate divisions with these widely differing

governments, with no one certain government or authority, is positively sublime! The Church, like any other organized body, must have some certain definite authority and government or it is no organized body at all.

One of two conclusions must be apparent to all men. Our Saviour and His Apostles organized the Church with some certain definite government and authority, or they did not intend she should have any government. If they wished her to have any certain government they most surely set this government over her. If they did leave this certain government over the Church, that certain government must have existed ever since, and will continue until the end, and no human being has the right to change it or interfere with it; and if there was no certain government intended, then it is certainly presumptuous in human beings to place their own governments over His Church. They would be claiming more wisdom than He exercised! So there can be only one government over the Church and that government must have always been the same or there is none at all. In other words, the Church He promised to be with was either in existence when Luther and Calvin made the first separation, or it was not. If it was not, then He had deserted her; if it was, then these reformers and all subsequent reformers are guilty of schism from that Church. The divine commission and instructions and authority were given to the Apostles. Where and when and in what way and by whom was Luther and Calvin, Knox, Coke, Asbury and Campbell and Williams, or any other human being except the Apostles, commissioned and instructed to organize churches. The Bible does not record

anyone being authorized, save the eleven Apostles. So the authority for any other church must come from some other source. Whence? Would any human being in the early days have dared organize a different church from the Apostles? Would any one have started a church in Crete, for instance, without the authority and consent of Titus? And if not, then when and in what way was any other human being authorized to start a church?

He either placed a certain government over His Church or He did not—one or the other. If He did, and promised to be with it till the end of the world, the same government is here now. If He did not, it is surely presumption in anyone to do what He did not want done.

"Men speak," says the Bishop of London, "as if Christians came first, and the Church afterwards; as if the origin of the Church was in the wills of the individual Christians who composed it. But, on the contrary, throughout the teaching of the apostles," we see that it is the Church which comes first and members of it afterward. Men were not brought to Christ and then determined that they would live in a community; men were not brought to believe in Christ and in the Cross, and then decided that it would be a great help to their religion that they should join one another in the worship of the Father through His name. In the New Testament, on the contrary, the Kingdom of Heaven is already in existence and men are invited into it. The Church takes its origin not in the will of man, but in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ. Everywhere men are called in; they do not come in and make the

Church by coming. They are called into that which already exists; they are recognized as members when they are within, but their membership depends upon their admission and not upon their constituting themselves a body in the sight of the Lord. In the New Testament the Church flows out from the Lord, not flows into Him. In the New Testament the ministers are sent forth to gather the children of men into the fold, and are not simply selected by the members of the Church to help them in their spiritual life."

It is now claimed by those Christians whose organizations are under the Presbyterian or Congregational governments, that the Apostolic Church was Presbyterian or it was Congregational according to their individual opinions. If, however, there is anything certain in the Christian system it is that the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons was unquestioned as the Apostolic government for fifty generations of Christians!

Suppose this question had really been a question in fact, and that it was up for settlement in the sixteenth century, would not the testimony of the Church, whose very organization was based on her continuous existence from the Apostles to that time, be conclusive evidence as to the Apostolic government as against the opinions of human beings who formed them then for the first time and promulgated them, not because it was Apostolic or Scriptural, but as an expedient and a necessity, and only as a reason for existence?

Says Dr. Powers: "For fifteen hundred years the polity of the Church was Episcopal, and no man thought it strange or questioned. But when, in the

days of the Reformation, men were aroused from their long, sleepy submission to Rome, and startled by the errors which had been ingrafted upon the Church in the Dark Ages, they became wild. They went to extremes in every direction.

"Grasping a single idea, the leaders let it control their thought and lead them to extravagance, folly, and error, and schism followed. Bent upon a single thought, they neglected other truths; and in their eagerness to impress that one, they set an example of and taught a carelessness about these others.

"Their business was to reform, but, carried away by the excitement of threatened danger and impulse and turmoil and fanaticism, they went beyond their task and undertook to construct anew. Luther broke loose from the Historic Church and lost the Episcopacy. He might have secured it. Brave Zwingli, in republican Switzerland, did no better; the Ana-baptists raged as turbulent insurrectionists; and Calvin, to establish in the faith of men his central thought, that Christianity and all things terrestrial are of a single, immutable, Divine decree, a hard study in the somber colors of Predestination, as the soul and worth of Christ and the New Testament, made all else subsidiary, lost authority and overlooked many a holy truth.

"Those days were as a great storm, when many, uncertain about the security of their anchorage, turned loose their little crafts, and, with unskilled crews, sailed away anywhere on the disturbed waters. A steady head and a steady hand alone could safely guide the Church through those days, and, thanks be to God,

in England such were found. Casting off the yoke of a foreign usurper, and the errors of the dark days of history, the Church of England, with firmness, held on to the true and necessary, withstood Rome and fanaticism alike, and brought the Historic Church strong and pure to us of to-day." (*"Why Not, and Why?"*)

Melanchthon, in the *Confession of Augsburg,* says: "There is no design to deprive the Bishops of their authority"; and in his apology for that Confession he says: "We do not mislike the authority of Bishops; we do here protest that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical polity; that it may not be imputed to us that the authority of Bishops is overthrown by us." Again he says: "I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops, for I see what manner of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical authority being dissolved." "By what right or law," he adds, "may we dissolve the ecclesiastical polity, if the Bishops will grant us that which in reason they ought to grant? And if it were lawful for us so to do, yet surely it were not expedient. Luther was ever of this opinion." In the Articles of Smalcald, Luther says: "The Church can never be better governed and preserved than when we all live under one Head, Jesus Christ, and all Bishops equal in office, though unequal in gifts, are most perfectly united in diligence, concord of doctrine, etc. * * * The Apostles were equal, and afterward the Bishops in all Christendom, until the Pope raised his head above all."

Beza, in his treatise against Saravia, says: "If there are any (which you shall hardly persuade me to believe) who reject the whole order of Episcopacy, God forbid

that any man of a sound mind should assent to the madness of such men."

But hear Calvin himself. He says, in his *Commentary on Titus*: "At this time (that is in the time of Titus) there was no equality among the ministers of the Church, but some one in authority and council had the pre-eminence. To every Bishop was committed the government of his own clergy, that they should rule their clergy according to the Canons and hold them to their duty." In his book, *De Necess. Reformand. Eccles.*, he has these words: "Let them give us such an hierarchy in which Bishops may be so above the rest, as they refuse not to be under Christ, and depend upon Him as their only Head; that they maintain a brotherly society, etc. If there be any that do not behave themselves with all reverence and obedience toward them, there is no anathema, but I confess them worthy of it." (*Kip's Double Wit.*, pp. 98-100.)

These were the great men and minds of the Reformation. These writings show that they regarded the government of the Church to be Episcopal, and it shows clearly that these men did not wish or intend to form permanent organizations independent of and rivals to the Church, but only to reform. These men regarded Episcopacy as a necessary part of the Church. They wished their organizations to be under the authority and sanction and government of the Bishops of the Church; and this would probably have been the result if they had not been so impatient, and had not let their zeal get away with their better judgment.

It was after those reformers had thrown discretion to the winds, and broken loose from the Church, and

had gone so far in their zeal that no Bishop of the Church could follow them, that then, with the Episcopacy lost to them, they began to claim the Presbyterian government for their organization and then to claim it as the Apostolic government.

And thus, after fifty generations of Christians had been born, baptized, confirmed and died in the Church under Episcopal government; fifteen hundred years after the Church started on her mission; then, for the first time in all the Christian ages, was there an assertion or claim for the Presbyterian government or a denial of the divinely appointed Bishops, Priests or Deacons. Then for the first time did any man claim to be a priest or presbyter in the Church of God who had not been thereto regularly ordained by Bishops of undoubted succession and authority from the Apostles!

What in all the world could the Church expect to gain by holding the Episcopal government as the Apostolic government if there was any question about it? There were then and are to-day many times more presbyters in the Church than in all the outside bodies holding the Presbyterian government, and many times more congregations under Episcopal government in the Church than in all the Christian bodies holding the Congregational government.

The Congregational idea of government came fast on the heels of the Presbyterian. The three-fold ministry, which all Christians had for fifteen hundred years regarded as the Apostolic government, having been questioned and disputed by the origination of the Presbyterian government, Mr. Robert Brown felt justified in forming an organization under his idea of Con-

gregational government. Mr. Brown himself a few years later abandoned the idea of the substitution of a human form of government in the Church for which our Saviour had provided His own system of government fifteen hundred years before, and he returned to the allegiance of the Church. His followers, however, kept up their organization on this basis, and it is now the government of millions of Christian people and partly a cause for their continual separation from the Church.

Strange that so many Christian bodies, who each hold and adhere to the Congregational government, are so divided and separated on so many things trivial in themselves. It would seem that the acknowledgment by great numbers of Christian people of one certain form of church government as the Apostolic government, would create such respect for that government, that its authority would hold them to one mind on minor matters; and it is this very splitting up of bodies of Christian people under Congregational government that proves it not to be the government and authority set over the Church by the Apostles.

The various and numerous divisions of Christians under the Congregational government contrary to the Bible, the lack of any general authority, the assertion of the right of every congregation to be a law and authority in itself, condemns the Congregational government as forming no feature of the Apostolic Church. As the government of congregations or societies within the Church and under the regular authority of the Church, this form of government might be very helpful and satisfactory, but, as the authority and government over the Church,

it naturally leads to separation on any subject one congregation holds differently from another. Congregationalists, Baptists and Disciples have the Congregational government, and they are as widely separated from each other as Presbyterians or Methodists are from them. Mr. Alexander Campbell was impressed with the Congregational government as the Apostolic government when he organized the Disciples' church, and still, with the Bible as his only guide and authority and with the Bible pleading for unity and against schism, he organizes another Christian body—thus further dividing the Christian fold—when there were already existing several Christian organizations having the form of government he considered divine. And if this government was the Apostolic government, as he felt and taught, then, in forming a new sect, when he could have used his influence and example to unite together the divided forces into one of the Congregational governments already existing, he was going contrary to our Saviour's prayer and the Bible warnings against division, because, there were then existing several bodies of Christians having that government, and therefore representing what he considered to be the divinely appointed government of the Church of God! And if there was then already existing the divinely ordered government of His Church, then Mr. Campbell's newer organization, no matter what he thought or intended it should be, became only a schism therefrom. Neither Mr. Campbell nor any other man can reform the Church by constructing anew, because that proves false our Saviour's promise to be with His Church till the end of the world. If His Church was

lost, or if Mr. Campbell was authorized to construct His Church anew, then He must have forsaken her.

Mr. Campbell honestly thought that if members of his organization called themselves Disciples of Christ, or simply "Christians," it would attract others and serve as a basis for union, as no one could object to being simply a Christian; but he only succeeded in further dividing up the Christian fold. He did not seem to realize that it is the *thing* and not the *name* that counts: That he and other Christians, by any other name, would still be Christians, and that Mohammedans, though called Christians, would still be Mohammedans. Any schism would still be a schism, and the Historic Church, His Church, the Divine organization He instituted, His bride, His body would still be His Church, whatever its name might be.

But is it possible that this can be the divinely appointed government for His Church? Could our Saviour have given instructions for His Church to be so governed as to allow so many different bodies, with no certain definite authority, to say which was right? Is it possible that the form of government of the church that was first evolved from the mind of Mr. Robt. Brown, fifteen hundred years after our Saviour had given His Apostles instructions as to the government of His Church, and which Mr. Brown afterwards repudiated, could be the Apostolic government? He spent forty days with His Apostles "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." Can it be possible that after all these elaborate instructions for the government of His Divine Church—His body, His bride—that in the next generation this divinely appointed

government—supposing it to have been Presbyterian or Congregational—should be abolished without noise or comment, and another—the Episcopal—substituted in its place, to remain unquestioned for fifteen hundred years, and then the original Apostolic government be set up by Mr. Robert Brown, who should himself afterward repudiate it? And this same question is applicable to the Presbyterian government or any other government save that of Bishops, Priests and Deacons which was the government of the Church in the beginning, was the government of the Church for fifteen centuries—unquestioned in the beginning and unquestioned during all these centuries.

The only Christian organization that existed all these centuries, the only body that represented Him and proclaimed Him all those years, the only organization that brought any knowledge of Him, or of the Christian religion at all, down through all those ages and centuries, through those dark ages of that dark night of time, from the sunset of Roman civilization to the sunrise of the present civilization, *the only organized Christian body of men that had any government at all, Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational,* this body of men, this divine organization, the Church of the living God, says with no uncertain or hesitating voice, that the Apostolic Church was Episcopal in its government and had the three orders of ministry. And she says this not as her *opinion,* but as a material fact of her very organization and existence.

To this Church the Christian world is indebted for the Bible, the inspired word of God, because, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, she selected the inspired

writings that make up the Bible. If she had not kept it all these centuries and brought it to us we would have no Bible, and if there has been any break in her continuous existence, if the Church was a different body in the early days when the canon of Scripture was settled from what she is now, how would we know it is the Bible? Only the Church, to which was committed the Bible and which has kept it all the time, can say with absolute knowledge and authority that it is the Bible, the inspired word of God. All other bodies have to take it as the inspired word of God, on the authority of the Historic Church. Mr. Luther, Mr. Calvin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Coke, Mr. Campbell and all the distinguished reformers know nothing of the Christian religion at all, except what was brought to them by the Church. There were no Lutherans before Mr. Luther's time, no Presbyterians before Mr. Calvin's time, no Congregationalists before Mr. Brown's time, no Baptists before John Boccold and John Matthews, in the sixteenth century, and none in this country until the time of Roger Williams and Ezekiel Holliman; no Methodists as a separate body before Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, no Disciples before Mr. Campbell. How can these men, just human beings, set *their opinions of the Church* over against the *testimony of the Church herself,* to which our Saviour gave His instruction and with which He promised to be till the end of the world, when, except for that Church, they could not have any knowledge or opinions of those early days of Christianity or of Christian matters at all! We might have our own opinions as to what the United States Government ought to be, but

what is that worth when the government is already a fixed thing?

The Apostles, in Acts vi., 3, do not seem to recognize the congregation as having authority to appoint its own officers.

But there is more involved in this question of Church government than either Episcopacy, Presbyterianism or Congregationalism.

In it is involved the authority for the Church as well as the authority in and over the Church. The very integrity of the Church, the continuity of the Church, the testimony of the Church, the very existence of the Church, of the Bible, of Christianity itself, is involved in this question of the government of the Church. The doctrine of the Historic Episcopate, or, as it is generally called, Apostolic Succession, is most intimately involved in the government of the Church. Episcopacy is the form of government of the Church, but there could be, and is, Episcopal government in religious bodies, (*i. e.,* government by men *called* Bishops) without Apostolic succession or authority, but there could be no Apostolic succession or authority without Bishops to succeed the Apostles; so when we speak of Episcopacy in connection with the Church it means more than simply government by men *called* Bishops. It means, in the Church, government by the successors of the Apostles. There are bodies of Christians, separated from the Church, who have the Episcopal government, in that they are governed by men called Bishops, who not only make no pretense to Episcopal government as the Church holds it, but repudiate it for themselves and even ridicule it as an extravagant, im-

pertinent, unsubstantiated and Pharisaical claim of the Church herself. In the Church, Bishop means successor to the Apostles, the representative of the Apostles, upon whom has fallen the Apostolic authority. In the religious bodies disclaiming now any allegiance to the Historic Church, Bishop means the highest office in those bodies. In the Church he is the divinely appointed head of certain parts of the Church, divinely appointed to "feed the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers to feed the flock of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood" (Acts xx. 28). In the other he is the human choice of his organization. In the Church, as high as he is, he is below the source of his consecration; in the other, he is higher than the source of his ordination. In the Church the source and authority of her Bishops are the Lord and His Apostles themselves. In the others the source of their Bishops is Martin Luther or Dr. Coke, or Mr. Francis Asbury or some other human being, who was not himself a Bishop. In the Church there is no place to start the Episcopacy, no place to begin except with the Apostles themselves under the instruction of our Saviour himself. In the other it starts with human beings like Luther and Coke and Asbury. In the Church the Bishops, by their continuous, unbroken line, are the witnesses of, and bear testimony to, all the early facts and truths of Christianity, of the Incarnation, Crucifixion and Resurrection of our Lord; and bring down to us "the faith once for all delivered," while in the other they can only bear witness to the opinions of their human founders.

Martin Luther and John Wesley, Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury could make a man the highest officer in the societies they organized, and they could call themselves Bishops, but they could not make a man a Bishop in the Church of God. Only Bishops who had themselves been made Bishops by other Bishops, and so on back to the Apostles themselves, could consecrate a man a Bishop in the church over which He Himself put the first Bishops, His chosen Apostles. John Wesley recognized this great fact in the Church. He was ordained a priest of the Church and vowed to teach her doctrine and support her polity, and one of the fundamentals of the Church is that Bishops can only be consecrated by Bishops. Mr. Wesley remained true to his vows all his life and died a priest of nearly fifty years service in the Church. Mr. Wesley could not make a man a Bishop, as the Church holds the office, and he knew it, and to claim that he did is to mar his beautiful character by making him false to his vows. He appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury superintendents of his Methodist Society in the United States, but he protested vehemently against their assuming the title of Bishop, because he felt that Bishops, like Apostles, should be exclusively titles of officers in the Church, and should not be self-assumed by private individuals in humanly organized societies until they had been consecrated thereto by other Bishops. John Wesley himself never deserted the church, nor did his Methodist Society separate from her until he was dead. He always looked on the Methodist Society as within the Church, an auxiliary to the Church, not a rival to her; and it grieved his last days that he saw so many of

his associates ambitious and eager to throw off the authority of the Church and separate from her. Would that men of to-day, who reverence the name of John Wesley, had the same regard for and the same loyalty to the Church that he held to the end. If they did, we too, at least, could become one, as our Saviour prayed, and could "strive together in the unity of the Spirit and bond of peace for the faith of the gospel."

The Historic Episcopate, or, as it is generally spoken of, Apostolic Succession, is a stumbling block in the minds of a great many of our separated brethren; but why should it be? What possible harm is there in it? It is looked on by many, who have not considered it and do not understand it, as only one of many church plans, all equally to be considered; as only a doctrine especially emphasized somewhat in the same way that Baptists emphasize immersion and the Presbyterians and Primitive Baptists do Predestination. Not claiming it themselves; knowing there is no Apostolic succession in their organization; and naturally considering their organization certainly equal, if not superior to and just as Biblical, if not more so, than other religious bodies; and not realizing that there *is* the one certain definite Church that has come down with this succession and authority, they look on the Church with more or less prējudice, as asserting a superior position over her rivals, and in their estimation, her equals in authority.

This, however, is not the way the Church holds or regards her Apostolic succession in connection with her separated brethren. There is no feeling of pride, or superiority, or self-aggrandizement, but rather a feeling of gratitude that she holds this priceless heritage, not

for herself alone, but for all the world. It does not make the Church feel that her Bishops or Priests or Deacons are any better men, or better preachers, more pious or more zealous. In these particulars she recognizes the superior worth of many of her separated brethren, but she does claim for the Historic Episcopate or Apostolic succession that it is the one certain definite Christian society—not just a succession of thought or practice, but of men—that has never for one moment lost its organic connection with the Apostles, and through them with our Saviour Himself, the only link that certainly and surely binds us to the past, the witness and keeper of the truth, the way and the only way we can know with certainty anything of the Christian religion, and the only way the Christian religion can be kept pure as at first. For if there be no Apostolic succession and authority here on the earth now, what authority have we for anything concerning Christianity, including the Bible? If there be no Apostolic succession, no organized connection with the Apostles, how can we know there were any Apostles at all? How can we know the great supernatural facts on which Christianity rests, the Incarnation, Crucifixion and Resurrection of our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, if there be no certain witness and authority organized for this purpose, which has come down to us by centuries of unbroken succession, bishop by bishop, from "the first Bishop and Shepherd of souls and His Apostles?" If there be no Apostolic authority and succession here now, how is the faith to be kept, and how is one to know it is the faith? If one man teaches error, how are we to know it, and who is to

correct it? By what standard is Christian teaching to be measured if every man has the authority to teach as he thinks? Can we know this from the testimony of the Bible alone if we dispute and discredit the Church that gave us the Bible? Who is to say what the real teaching of the Bible is, if each man is to interpret it according to his own ideas and judgment? Would we have any Bible if there be no succession and authority of the Apostles? Who could make it the Bible? Who is authority for it? Who can know there is any Bible, or that this is the Bible, or that it was inspired, if there was and is no certain definite Apostolic authority and succession? Our Saviour never once mentioned the Bible save the old Scriptures. You cannot tell *from the Bible* that our Saviour ever expected or intended there should be any Bible as we have it. He spent forty days with His Apostles after His Resurrection, speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. This was the origin of the Church, and the Church afterward selected the books of the Bible. The Bible is a *human* creation under divine guidance—a product of His Church, but the Church herself is of divine creation. There was no Bible in our Saviour's time save the Old Testament. There was none during the lives of the Apostles. There was no New Testament as we have it for three hundred years after the Church was founded. One church had one epistle and another church another, and thus the sacred, inspired writings that were afterwards selected as the New Testament, were for those three hundred years scattered through various churches, one here, another there, some other elsewhere. If there were no

certain Apostolic succession and authority all these years, and if there were none when the books of the New Testament were selected, how could they have been selected? Let us suppose, for example, that the Apostles did pass away without providing for any authority or succession in the Church; and that the various churches scattered over a large territory were without any Apostolic authority for three hundred years—ten generations of people. We ask if you would be willing to take the Bible, under the selection of such an uncertain authority, as the inspired Word of God? Does this not show that there must have been the most absolute, certain, definite, continuous, organized succession from the Apostles to select for all the Christian world for all time to come those portions of the sacred writings that were to be taken and accepted as the inspired Word of God?

At our Saviour's ascension there were only eleven Apostles. The very first thing the Church did immediately after His ascension, while His instructions were fresh in their minds, was to meet in that upper chamber in Jerusalem and select a successor to Judas, "and the lot fell on Matthias and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." (Acts i. 26.) Then St. Paul and St. Barnabas were made Apostles. "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." (Acts xiii., 2-3.) Then says St. Paul: "When James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that

we should go unto the heathen and they unto the circumcision." This certainly makes fourteen Apostles without question, and does away with the usually accepted theory that there were only twelve. (Gal. ii., 9.) Again: "But other of the Apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother." (Gal. i., 19.) In I. Cor. i., 12, we find Apollos was an Apostle, as St. Paul speaks of him and St. Peter and himself as equal in authority. "Now, this I say, that every one of you saith I am of Paul and I of Apollos and I of Cephas and I of Christ." Turning to Acts xvii. 24, we find who Apollos was: "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in spirit he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John * * * whom, when Aquilla and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them and expounded into him the way of the Lord more perfectly." St. Timothy was an apostle or bishop: "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands: And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (II Timothy vi. 2.) Titus was another apostle or bishop: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee * * * for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God * * * holding fast the faithful word as he hast been taught

that he may be able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince the gainsayer." (Titus i., 5-9.)

Here we have Matthias, St. Paul, St. Barnabas, St. James, Apollos, St. Timothy, and Titus as Apostles in addition to the original eleven. There are many other names mentioned, who evidently were likewise Apostles. If the Apostolic authority ceased with the original twelve, what was the purpose and place and authority of St. Paul, of St. Timothy, of Titus, of Apollos, of St. James, and the others who were clearly in some Apostolic position? And if these and others were ordained and clothed with Apostolic authority, and if this system was continued for three hundred years so that the Bible could be selected with Apostolic authority, *when did it cease?*

Now the Church's position is this: that it was the divine plan of our Saviour for the perpetuation of His Church and the keeping and promulgation of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," that the Apostolic authority was to continue with the Church always. In proof of this she points to the detailed selection of Matthias immediately after the ascension of our blessed Lord when his instructions were so fresh they could not be misunderstood. She points to the Apostolic authority exercised by St. Paul, St. James, St. Timothy, and Titus and Apollos, who were made and accepted as Apostles or bishops under the same instructions as was Matthias, and she asserts that this has continued in the Church, this consecration of bishop by bishop, from then till now. She asserts that there has never been a moment of time when a man would be taken and accepted as a bishop of the Church, unless he had been

thereto ordained by other bishops, who derived their authority from other bishops, running thus back bishop by bishop to the Apostles.

She offers the unquestioned proof of the Bible for the beginning of this Apostolic succession, and she asks, if the succession was not to continue, when did it cease and what was it started for? It certainly began and was a part of the Church plan in Apostolic days; when did it cease? Is the burden on the Church to prove the continuousness of this succession, when her very existence is based on this? Or, having shown its commencing, is not the burden on the cavillers to prove its discontinuance? This is the Church's position: If there is no Apostolic succession, no continuous succession from the Apostles, and if the Church is not clothed with their authority here and now, and if the Christian religion is properly represented by these antagonistic divisions, then there is no reason for her existence, because God knows there are sects enough without us, if that is all we are.

As Mr. John Wesley pointed out in his CXV. sermon, to be evangelists and preachers and helpers within the Church and under her authority, is a vastly different thing from setting up another ministry humanly ordained in place of the divinely appointed historic Priesthood.

Finally, as was suggested in the chapters on Immersion, Infant Baptism and Predestination, would it not be safer, to say the least of it, to listen to and accept the Church's plea for the Historic Episcopate as a basis for the unity of Christendom? If there were no succession to the Apostolic authority and if the well-being of the Church and the preservation and integrity of

the faith was left to the individual Christian and to voluntary organizations or societies, then the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate cannot possibly do any harm. It is certainly as good as any human plan. But, on the other hand, if the Historic Episcopate is the divine way, the divinely appointed ministry like the Priesthood of old; if our Saviour chose this as His plan for the continuation and perpetuation and authority of His Church, His own chosen witness and keeper of the truth and faith, as the Church has received it, then what a terrible mistake our brethren make to thrust it aside and, like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, say: "Ye take too much upon you seeing all the congregation are holy." (Numbers xvi. 3.)

CHAPTER VII.

Roman Catholicism and Christian Unity.

The Roman Catholic Conception of the Church is, as its name implies, part Roman, part Catholic. The Catholic part will be considered in the chapter devoted to the Catholic Conception of the Church.

The Roman theory is, that the Apostle St. Peter was chosen and left by our Saviour as the supreme head of His Church; that to him he gave the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and that the Bishop or Pope of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, is now the supreme head of His Church, the infallible vice-gerent of God on earth, to whom is committed the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that no one is a member of His Church or can be saved unless he or she is in communion with and allegiance to him.

Our Saviour's prayer and the Apostles' pleadings can never find answer under the Roman theory, which has added to the faith once for all delivered as the Protestant theory has taken from it. The Roman influence was at one time all-dominant in the Catholic Church, and for many centuries, by its political power and importance, held the Church in its grasp, and had every opportunity to show to the world its unifying and upraising power; but like every distortion of the truth that goes far enough and deep enough, its very power proved its own weakness. Its hold and influence, unnaturally distorted and unwisely wielded, brought so many errors and so much corruption on the

Church that men, despairing of any reform within the Church, went to the other extreme, threw off all authority of the Church and constructed anew, thus laying the foundations for the frightful havoc in the Christian ranks of to-day. The errors and corruptions that befouled the Church, the direct result of the Roman system in its legitimate course, were the primary cause of the first great schism and separation from the Church, and are really and primarily responsible for all the heresies and false doctrines of this day.

There have been great and good men Bishops or Popes of Rome, as great and good as bishops of any other diocese or province, as great and good as the Patriarchs of any of the divisions of the Universal Church; and also there have been men made Bishops of Rome as vicious, as unscrupulous, as unprincipled, as licentious, as despicable, as wicked and degraded as the vice-gerent of the devil himself could be—and, under the Roman theory, these men were vicars of Christ, supreme over all other Bishops! infallible expounders of the Christian faith!

Some of the strongest and best movements in all the ages for the uplifting of humanity, for the moral and spiritual welfare of the world, for the preservation of the Christian religion, have been inaugurated, directed and completed by the Bishops of Rome; and all honor to them for it! They were the overseers in perhaps the greatest portion of the Catholic Church, and they served their Lord and Master well and have gone to their heavenly reward with the words "Well done" ringing in their ears! And there have also been men made Bishops of Rome, and consequently, under

the Roman theory the supreme head of His Church, the infallible vice-gerents of Christ on earth, who have planned and encouraged, approved and engaged in the most horrible crimes—murders, massacres, tortures, debauchery and licentiousness! By far the great majority have been great and good men, earnest, zealous, pious; but there have been enough of the others to bring shame on the Church, and the more shame because of their high claims under the Roman system.

If reason and Scripture and history bore out the Roman claims, I would not contend that the wickedness of some of her popes should be any argument against it any more than when this is not the case; the merits of others should argue for it. It is not reasonable, however, nor is it borne out by Scripture or history. It would mean that our Saviour, after selecting twelve, and knowing even then that one of these twelve would prove untrue, intended to make one other supreme, and thus inaugurate a system by which, in future generations, the successors to this one should also be supreme; knowing, too, that this system would put men in this high place, under a plan of His own devising, who would be as bad as Judas himself—men, selected by His own plan, as His vice-gerents, the infallible expounders of the faith, who in their high positions would bring such shame on Him! Is this reasonable? What was the occasion for His selecting twelve anyway, unless to so provide for the continuance and government of His Church, that if in future generations some Judas should be chosen he would be only one in twelve, without voice or influence enough to do violence to His Church. Under the Roman theory

he would be supreme, above all others, and his voice and influence so paramount as to bring such shame on the Church as she has experienced.

Around the aggregation and centralization of power in one man's hands and the patronage he thereby controls there always gathers an atmosphere of politics, of wire pulling, of political trickery and chicanery and intrigue; and the Roman system is no exception. Along with the pure, zealous, pious motives that actuate some there is always the gratification of human ambitions in others; and Rome is no exception to the rule that, as in all other political contests for one man power, the latter class have the advantage over the former—as politicians have over statesmen—in that they will stoop to proceedings the other will not.

There are some things connected with the history of the Church and some passages in the Bible that unless analyzed would come near supporting the Roman theory—some arguments that are on their face very plausible, as for instance: when the mists of the dark ages are somewhat clearing away and history becomes more matter of fact and less mythological, the Church was certainly under the power and influence of the Roman See; and if no account is taken of the gradual development, or rather the causes, of this condition, it is easy for the Roman Churchman to maintain his position. Likewise with their Scripture claim, when seemingly we see it plainly stated in the Bible in these words: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven; and I say unto thee that thou art Peter,

and upon this Rock will I build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." Mat. xvi. 16-19. And again in John xxi., 15-16: "So when they had dined, Jesus saith unto Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these?' he saith unto Him. 'Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love Thee.' He saith unto him, 'Feed my lambs.' He saith unto him the second time, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?' He saith unto Him, 'Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' He saith unto him, 'Feed my sheep.'" I say, when we find such statements as these in the Bible, it takes more than the abuse and vituperation of Protestant Christianity to nullify the power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Church is common prey of Protestant denominations. They are hardly considered in good standing if they do not throw a brick at her on every opportunity. There is a book called "The Church of God," written by a layman of one of the Protestant denominations, in which he calls the Roman Catholic Church a Harlot, the Man of sin, Babylon, and other hard names. We do not feel that way about the Roman Church at all. We regard the Roman system and influence in the Catholic Church as primarily responsible for all the separations and schisms of the last four hundred years and the present chaotic condition of Christianity, but we regard this as resulting only from the Romanisms of that branch or division of the Catholic Church. She is

a Christian Church, and all her members are Christians, are our brothers, and we ought rather to reason with than abuse them. However corrupt she has been in times past, however despotic, unbrotherly, and uncatholic now, she is yet a *true,* if erring, branch of the Apostolic Church, and while we always have protested and always will protest against her errors and corruptions, we know she is a part of the ancient Church. She is a part of the great Catholic and Apostolic Church of the world, and when in God's own time she shall throw off the Roman errors that have fastened themselves on her during the ages, she will help to unify Christianity and atone for the schism she brought on the Church four hundred years ago. But unity of all Christians can never be brought about until she does cease to be more Roman than Catholic.

If the Roman Catholic Church would do this, it would be an easy matter to unify Christianity. Protestants would be attracted, because they could see that there is no need for separate existence. They could not protest against *Catholicity,* but they never could accept her Romanisms. It is important, then, most important, that we study and understand just what real basis she has for these Roman ideas.

As to the historical argument, we quote from *"Why Not and Why"*: "When Polycarp was in Rome, while Anicetus was Bishop, he differed with the Bishop, and would not yield his point to Anicetus, and the latter did not think of exercising any authority over him, but treated him as a brother bishop, worshipped with him and they separated as two equal and friendly bishops (Eusebius Book V., Chap. XXIV., 15, 16, 17). St.

Cyprian says: "None of us styles himself bishop of bishops, or forces his colleagues to obedience, by dread of his tyrany." (Browne, Art. XXXVII., Section 7, Note.) Jerome says: "Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome or Engubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis, he is of the same excellency, of the same episcopate." (Stearns, page 153, quoting Ep. to Evangelus.) The first general council of Nicea was called by Constantine, not by the Bishop of Rome, nor was it presided over by the Pope. The second general council was held at Constantinople, and was called by the Emperor Theodosius, not by the Pope of Rome (Theodoret V., 6, and Socrates VII., 34), and it was presided over by Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, not by the Pope of Rome. The council of Ephesus was called by Theodosius also and presided over by Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria, not by the Pope. To further show what the Church then thought of Roman supremacy, the Pope of Rome, was dissatisfied with some actions of this council, and *requested* Theodosius to call another, which he refused to do (Stearns, Chap. X., quoting Dupin, Cent. V., Chap. 2). The 28th canon of the council of Chalcedon, in which council were six hundred and thirty bishops, actually in its terms forbids Papal supremacy (Gieseler, Vol. I., Sec. 93, N. 14). At the end of the sixth century Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, writing to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, says: "No one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a title, plainly because if a single Patriarch be called Universal, the name Patriarch is taken from the rest * * * wherefore, presume not ever to give

or receive letters with this title Universal again." (Ep. v. 43.) Again: "You are my brother in rank * * * , and behold in the very heading of your letter directed to me, the very person who forbade it, you set that haughty title calling me Universal Bishop, which I beg your holiness to do no more." (Ep. viii. 30.) It is hardly necessary to refer to the Isodorian decretals, which are now so well known to have been forged, as hardly to merit mention. They were forged to uphold the growing supremacy; are now known to be forged, but are still used for the same purpose. (See Gibbons' "Faith of Our Fathers.")" These historical facts, and many more not mentioned, are absolutely conclusive that the Roman claims are modern, and were not known to the early Church.

Turning back to the Scripture claims, let us analyze them. Turn back to the 16th chapter of Matthew, 13th verse: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, "Whom do men say that I am?" and they said, "Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; some Elias, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." He saith unto them, "But whom do ye say that I am?" Then follows the conversation between St. Peter and our Saviour; and then in the 20th verse we find: "Then charged He his disciples that they should tell no one that He was Jesus the Christ." It will be noted that our Saviour was addressing His disciples collectively all the way through. He asked them first whom they said He was, and closed by charging them to tell no one; and the conversation only shows that St. Peter was the spokesman, and was speaking as representative of all the

disciples. If the conversation had not been repeated as a conversation, and had been expressed in the third person, as the beginning and end was, it would be seen that "He told *them* that *they* were blessed, because flesh and blood had not revealed it to *them,* and He gave *them* the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven;" and if the whole conversation had been repeated in the first and second person as well as the portion quoted, we would find our Saviour asking St. Peter who He was, and ending by cautioning him to tell no one. It seems entirely plain and natural that He was addressing St. Peter as spokesman and representative of all the disciples. It would be unnatural and unreasonable to assume that He had the disciples in His mind when He asked, "Whom do ye say that I am?" and then St. Peter individually in His mind when He gave the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, and the disciples again in His mind when He charged them to tell no one, all in the same conversation. Which one of the disciples did He address when He asked them, "Whom do men say that I am?" and which disciple replied, "Some say thou art John the Baptist; some Elias, and others Jeremiah or one of the Prophets?" St Peter evidently carried on the whole conversation. It would seem plain from the narrative that when the conversation is given verbatim, our Saviour was, of course, addressing St. Peter, because St. Peter answered His question addressed to *them all,* and naturally St. Peter's answer was in name of all, and not individually; and that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and authority over the Church was given to them all, collectively, the actual conversation being carried on by St. Peter. If

not, and St. Peter personally was chosen as supreme head, it would be difficult to reconcile the language used by our Saviour in almost the next breath as found in 23rd verse: "But he turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind Me, Satan; thou art an offence to Me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Could the politics of the Roman Curia in any age possess a standing rebuke of greater significance? This was certainly said to St. Peter in his personal capacity, and we ask our Roman brethren, for they alone can answer: If St. Peter was chosen here as supreme, how reconcile this almost curse? I ask it yet again: If our Saviour had just a few moments before selected St. Peter out of the twelve to be His supreme, infallible vice-gerent on earth, just as they ask us to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be now, how could He nearly curse him and compare him to Satan almost at once? This is irreconcilable. It certainly seems the most consistent way to take this is, that He was addressing St. Peter as spokesman and representative of all the Disciples, and that authority was given to them all equally.*

---

*I am aware this is not the usual interpretation of this passage of Scripture, but it really seems to the author to be the most reasonable and natural view of it. It is usually conceded that our Saviour was here especially favoring St. Peter, and promised him here the keys to the kingdom, which He afterwards gave to all the Apostles. (Matt. xviii., 1, 18.)

But even if we may not insist that St. Peter was acting as the spokesman merely of the apostles who held communion with one another, and the knowledge of which communion is implied in our Lord's question, "Whom

Turning now to the 21st chapter of St. John again, where our Saviour has been telling St. Peter to feed the sheep, and at the 20th, 21st and 22nd verses we read: "Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following * * * Peter, seeing him, saith to Jesus, 'Lord, and what shall this man do?' Jesus saith unto him, 'If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee' ?" *"What is that to thee?"* We ask our Roman brethren again, if this is not strange language to use to His own chosen vicar? Now by turning to the 1st general Epistle of St. Peter, Chap. V., 1, 2, 3, you will find that St. Peter himself

---

say ye that I am?" it is plain that we may insist on an honest answer to these questions. What was it that flesh and blood did not, but the Father in heaven did, reveal to Peter? Was it not this—that foundation verity of Christianity—that the Christ was the Son of the Living God? Thus spake the angel, whose inspiration also was not of the earth, but from heaven, "Wherefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." One would think to hear Roman apologists dilate upon this subject, that the matter which was revealed to Peter was, that he was to be "the Pope of Rome" and exercise lordship over his fellows and the nations of the world in those things which "savor of men" rather than of God. The rock on which Christianity and the Church was founded was not Peter, but Jesus, God Incarnate, the Rock of Ages, and He was the chief corner-stone, St. Peter, along with the other apostles, just being stones in the foundation. St. Peter must ever be held blessed for this bold utterance, under divine impulse, of the root of the whole matter, that the Christ is the Son of the Living God; and that he was perhaps the first to receive the keys of the kingdom does not detract from the power of the keys given to all the apostles and to their successors through them.

did not understand that he and his successors alone should feed the sheep, but that this was equally for all the Apostles and their successors. St. Peter seems to have considered himself as one of the shepherds along with the other Apostles, and that the only chief shepherd was Jesus Himself. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the suffering of Christ and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, *neither as being lords over God's heritage,* but being ensamples to the flock, and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Is this consistent if St. Peter and his successors only were to feed the sheep? He does not seem to think there was any supreme, infallible head of the Church, the only Chief Shepherd, he thinks of, being Jesus Christ. Another Roman claim is, that, in the expression from St. Matthew: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church," Peter is the Rock. This is another plausible claim, which, if taken on its surface, seems to bear out their position. Careful reading will convince any fair-minded person that it is not Peter himself personally that was the rock upon which "He would build His Church so that the gates of hell should not prevail against it," but upon the confession of St. Peter, made for all the disciples, that "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God;" and it is upon this, the Church is built, and the gates of hell can never prevail against it. We find this same confession at other places, and

always met with the utmost approbation of our Saviour. "Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die; believest thou this? She saith unto him, 'Yea, Lord, I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.'" (John xi. 25-27.) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." (1st John v. 1.) "But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through Him." (John xx. 31.) And the Eunuch was baptized by Philip on the same confession: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The Rock the Church is built on is not St. Peter, but our Saviour Himself, the Son of the Living God, and if our Roman brethren would but recognize this, how easily unity could be brought about.

Those portions of the sacred writings, which compose the Canon of Scripture, were selected by the Catholic Church, under divine guidance, in the fourth century, after the Church had been at work nearly four hundred years. If the Pope of Rome was, by divine appointment, the supreme, infallible head of the Church, would we not find, in these sacred records, some hint, some suggestion or some authority for it? We would certainly want these sacred writings to be consistent with these claims. We would want to reconcile Papal supremacy, at least, by inference. On the contrary, however, the entire sacred record is against this heresy. Not a single passage can be rightfully said to support it, while many passages, directly and to the point, condemn it. No less than three

of the Gospels record our Saviour being asked which should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven, and He would answer that only those that became as little children should be the greatest. What opportunities were lost if He intended St. Peter or the Pope of Rome to be "Lords over God's heritage"! In Matt. xx., 25-27, our Saviour says: "You know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." In Matt. xxiii., 10-11, He says, "Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ, but he that is greatest among you shall be your servant." Can any reasonable, healthy mind, Roman Catholic or otherwise, really, truly believe that if our Saviour intended any such thing as Papal supremacy or infallibility, He would not have said something at least consistent therewith?

Again, if St. Peter was really chosen by our Saviour as His supreme representative, it would be passing strange that he should so persistently deny Him. *The Rock upon which His Church is built denying Him thrice.* Strange example to be set by the supreme head of the Church, to whom alone was given the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, and by whose infallible lips the faith should be expounded.

It would be also strange that "when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God they sent unto them Peter and John." (Acts viii., 14.) The Apostles sending the supreme, infallible head of the Church! If the Pope

is the supreme, infallible head of the Church now, he always has been. The faith once delivered, which St. Jude admonishes us to contend for, is the same now as in the beginning, and if the Pope of Rome is now the supreme head of the Church, he was then, and thus we have the Apostles *sending* the Pope and St. John to Samaria. Is this reconcilable with the Roman theory?

We find, too, that at the very first council of the Church held at Jerusalem, as recorded in 15th chapter of Acts of the Apostles, called to settle a question that was agitating the Church, St. James presided, and the decision was rendered in the name of St. James. Strange, indeed, this, if St. Peter was the head of the Church as the Pope now claims to be. Strange, too, that St. Paul, in the 2nd chapter of Galatians, should record "withstanding Peter to his face because he was to be blamed." Is this consistent with the theory that St. Peter was supreme head of the Church? Would the Church record as a part of the sacred canon of Scripture this stricture on her infallible head by St. Paul?

Then, too, how strange that St. Paul should (in 2nd Cor. x. 1-28), after repeating the many burdens on him, use this language: "Besides these things which are without, that which comes upon me daily, the care of all the churches." How could St. Paul say this consistently if St. Peter had the care of all the churches on himself?

Again, in Galatians ii., 9, St. Paul says: "And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship."

Would St. Paul have used this language if St. Peter, by divine appointment, was the chosen head? "James, Cephas, and John who seemed to be pillars." What a strange expression if St. Peter was the infallible vicar of Christ, the supreme head of the Church!

In Cor. xii. 28, St. Paul says: "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." In Eph. iv., 11, he repeats, "And He gave some Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." How in all this world could St. Paul have left out of his list of Church officers, on the only two occasions when he mentions them at all, the highest, most important of all—the Pope!

In I Cor. i. 12-13, St. Paul was told by those of the household of Chloe that there were divisions among the Corinthians, some saying they were of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Cephas. Now cast your mind back nineteen hundred years and imagine St. Peter as the divinely appointed infallible, supreme head of the Church, just as the Roman Church claims. Would not those Corinthian Christians then, just about twenty or thirty years after our Saviour had so appointed him, have known which was in authority, Paul, Cephas or Apollos? Is it possible they would not have known the Pope from Paul and Apollos? We ask yet again, "How could these things be," and how could they be recorded in the Bible, the creation of the Catholic Church, if that Catholic Church was under the authority of St. Peter's successor, the infallible head of the Church, supreme over all other bishops by divine appointment?

St. Peter was the chief apostle, so recognized by his brethren. He was spokesman when our Lord was speak-

ing with His apostles, presided at the first meeting of the Church, when Matthias was selected in Judas' place, preached the first sermon, opened the doors to both Jew and Gentile. All this is true, and we would not detract one iota from his honors. But after this is said all is said. The claim that any special honor was, by divine right, to attach to St. Peter alone even all his own life; or that he, separate from his brother Apostles, was to have any special successsor; or that his successor was to have any superior position over the successors of the other Apostles; or that there is any connection between him and the Bishop of Rome any more than between him and any other Bishop of the Church; or that the Bishop of Rome is endowed with any supremacy or infallibility, or even primacy, on account of St. Peter, or by divine right, are Roman constructions throughout, are frauds on the Catholic Church, are contrary in toto to Scripture, are supported by forged and distorted arguments, by superstition, and by the very glamor and magnitude of these claims; and, for sake of the purity of the Church, should be condemned in season and out of season by every true Catholic.

Rev. A. W. Little, the author of "Reasons for Being a Churchman," says: "The great Roman Catholic Church, made up of all those National Churches, which to-day render obedience to the Bishop of Rome, along with the Italian missions which have been intruded into the jurisdiction of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, is a noble, beautiful, important part of God's Holy Catholic Church; it is zealous for the divinity of our blessed Lord and the revelation that He made; it holds to the primitive creeds and the sacra-

mental system; it sets before its people and before the world a grand, reverent and uplifting type of public worship, and, on the whole, it abounds in good works for the bodies and souls of men. All this is true and is acknowledged by all thoughtful men. But while this is true, and while we have, so far, many points in sympathy, and respect, and love for the 'Holy Roman Church,' nevertheless the Papacy itself, on which all the errors of Rome depend, is the most gigantic fraud and imposture in the whole history of the world. The methods by which the Bishop of the Diocese of Rome, gradually, during many centuries, aggrandized himself and usurped tyrannical and iniquitous domination over his brother bishops, who are his equals in office, were methods of forgery, violence, superstition and suppression of the truth. By such means, the Bishop of Rome asserted his claim of universal dominion as the vicar of Christ on earth and as the supreme and infallible head of the Church."

The Church in the first few centuries was the one Catholic Apostolic Church, with no division or schism, and while false doctrines and erroneous teaching would occasionally manifest themselves, it was easy to repel them and keep the faith pure and unalloyed. There was no Roman supremacy and no sectarianism. Papacy was a growth on the Church fostered by the influential position of the Roman diocese in the Church and accelerated by the ambition of some of her bishops, as time and opportunity favored the ambitions of men, called to the high office, who were strong minded, able, and some at least utterly unscrupulous. The Roman Empire was in the height

of its power, was the recognized center of commerce, civilization, culture, and education; and as the Christian religion spread and Rome became more and more Christian, the Bishop of Rome, as the Bishop of the most important province or diocese of the Church, began to be looked on as the principal or most important and influential Bishop, and was made Primate of the Church; but it must be remembered that the early fathers gave the primacy to old Rome, not because of any connection with St. Peter, but because it was the imperial city. Disputes were referred to him, matters connected with the Church's government, doctrines, etc., settled by him; and as this natural and geographical importance of the Roman See became more and more pronounced, men of ambitious minds, and often by unscrupulous methods, sought its bishopric, and, naturally, built up their power and influence in every way possible. The power and influence of the Roman Bishop, thus gradually developing, became more and more paramount, until it assumed the proportions and position we find in the middle ages.

From the assumption of supremacy by the Bishop of Rome over the successor of all the other Apostles; from the power it gave him and those he patronized; by the manner in which it was often exercised, and out of the false doctrines, errors, and corruption it promulgated and taught, and the political ambitions it fostered and engendered, have resulted crimes, murders, poisonings, licentiousness, shame, and immorality of men acting under the authority of a branch of the Catholic Church as the vicars of the gentle, loving Jesus. Bloody wars and persecution, the terrible massacre of St. Barthol-

omew and others, the horrors and tortures of the inquisition, and the final woeful time of the Reformation and the present distracted state of Christendom are all—all—all of them results, more or less direct, of that awful blasphemy of the supremacy and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome.

If the Bishop of Rome had only been content to remain Primate or first among his brother bishops, no matter how important and advantageous his See; if the Church had remained free from the intrigues and ambitions and unscrupulous politics and wire-pulling, and over-reaching that centres around the aggregation and centralization of power in one man's hands, is there a Roman Churchman to-day that believes the fair name of the Catholic Church would ever have been marred with the scandals, licentiousness, and utter abandonment of John XXIII., Innocent VIII., and Alexander VI., or with such a parody as the twelve years old child Pope Benedict IX. Without the influence of the Roman system would the Church have had to bear the blame on her fair shoulder of the murders, poisonings, lying, cheating, usurpation, tumults, the scheming, and lobbying that accompanied the selection and election and official and personal acts and lives of Sabinian, John VIII., Boniface VI., Stephen VI., Christopher Sergius III., John X., John XII., John XIX., Gregory VI., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., Clement V., John XXII., Urban VI., Paul II., Sextus IV., Julian II., Leo X., Clement VII., Paul III., Julian III., Pius IV.?

It is not that some bad men would not have gotten into the Church as bishops, but it is the Roman system

which fosters the political wire-pulling that puts such men in this high position. It is the Roman system that creates this high office, and then political scheming fills it.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew is hardly conceivable if the Church in France had been simply the French Catholic Church free from the taint of Roman supremacy. The horrors of the inquisition are hardly imaginable aside and apart from the Roman system. France would not now be in the throes of almost atheistical influence if the Church there had been the Catholic Church pure and free from Roman influence. The Church, under the Roman system, can never exercise its full power for good, and for Christ. It works, first for Rome and then for Christ.

Nor would there be the almost countless heresies, schisms, divisions of this day if the errors and corruption of Rome, her corrupt teachings of Purgatory and Indulgences that were directly traceable to the Papal supremacy had not driven Luther, Calvin, and the others to the opposite extreme.

Is it any wonder that men of that day, unable to distinguish between what was Catholic and what was Roman, between the good and the bad, turned their backs on everything that had any reminder of the Roman Church? Throwing overboard Romanism and Catholicity alike, they went from one extreme to the other, broke loose from the Historic Church, and with no pilot, no log book and no compass, with unskilled crews, they set sail in their crude crafts of their own making over the wide, unknown waters.

We will not go into any argument or controversy about any special errors of the Roman Church, any false teachings or practices, because if we can reach the fountain head and source of all the errors and false and heretical doctrines that are playing such havoc with the Christian religion; if we can do away with the great and terrible faith-changing and faith-destroying Roman dogma of papal supremacy and infallibility, all other errors and corruption will vanish, and we will have the Church pure and united as at first.

There is one thing, however, that can be mentioned, and that is, their insistence on a celibate clergy. When the Roman Church is making such high claims on account of St. Peter, it is just as well to remember that St. Peter was a married man, and it was St. Paul who argued for celibacy. Celibacy in the clergy is a most excellent thing, just so far as St. Paul recommended and no farther. If a man can serve his God and the Church better unmarried, by all means encourage him in it. If he can serve his God and the Church better married, for God's sake do not make him a libertine and a reproach to the Church just to carry out an inflexible scheme that is not a part of the faith once delivered. How can the Roman Church insist on a line of living as essential for all her priests that absolutely condemns St. Peter's life and conduct. It was St. Paul that advised single life if it could be safely led. St. Peter does not seem to have considered it worth mentioning.

Likewise with some other matters and teachings of the Roman Church, like transubstantiation, worship of the Virgin Mary, Saints, images, relics and in-

dulgences. If these are conducive to the more reverential worship of our Lord and Master, if they are helpful and encourage true devotion, by all means let every man have every possible help in his Christian life and experience; but do not force as matter of faith non-essential practices that, while helpful to some, are repulsive to others, and cannot be counted as essential to salvation.

Rome has so brought the great name Catholic down into so much mire and disgrace that in many men's minds it is the synonym of mockery, idolatry, wickedness and superstition. To vast numbers of people the great name Catholic, on account of its association with the abuses of the Roman Church, signifies narrowness, cruelty, bigotry. Her tortures, cruelty and oppression will ever remain the greatest blot and blur on the pages of the Universal Church. The most beautiful ceremonies and practices of the ancient Catholic Church are neglected, despised, and condemned because she practices them. Private confession and absolution, one of the most helpful practices of the ancient Church—a practice that brings calm to the sin-tossed soul, that brings our religion closer, closer to us—has been almost abandoned in many parishes, because Rome makes so much of it. Of course, there is no more reason in this than, as Bishop Brown says, there would be for a man to refuse to use a cook stove because his enemy had one, but it is one of the effects of the Roman system.

The Roman Church is Apostolic in her origin, succession, and authority, but she is far from being exclusively *Catholic* in fact and practice. She has become almost as Roman and worldly as she is Catholic.

These are some of the reasons why the Roman conception of the Church can never bring unity to the people of God, but all of them are included in the one great heresy of supremacy and infallibility, and as all the others would melt away by the abandonment of that, there is no use dwelling on any other.

Rome offers no certain basis for unity in any case. Even if her present claims could be accepted, who can tell what she will add to the faith or require as essential to salvation next week or next month or next year? She has added and taught as essential to faith and salvation, matters never thought of by the Apostles, and if we are ever to hold the faith in the unity of the spirit and bond of peace, that faith must be the faith, once for all delivered, which St. Jude admonishes us to contend for.

CHAPTER VIII.

Anglican Catholicism and Christian Unity.

"And Simon Peter answered and said, thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi. 16-18.)

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19-20.)

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1. 8.)

The Catholic conception is, that the Church is not just an aggregation of any number of human organizations instituted in accordance with the ideas and opinions of human beings; that it is not just an invisible, intangible ideal left for human beings to work out according to their own notion or feeling, but that it is a visible divine organization instituted by our Saviour, Jesus Christ himself, who gave His Apostles, during the forty days He spent with them after His resurrection and before His ascension, full and explicit directions and instruction for the organization and conduct, the oversight and care, the extension and perpetuation of His Church. "To whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion by many in-

fallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." (Acts i. 3.)

That these Apostles, acting under these sacred instructions, organized His Church in that first meeting in that upper chamber in Jerusalem, at which Matthias was selected as successor to Judas, as described in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; and that thus the very first act of the Church done immediately after His ascension, with His instructions fresh in their mind, was to provide for her continuance by the selection and election of a successor to the original Apostle. That the Church was right then, was immediately afterward, was during the lifetime of the original Apostles, was in the first century, the second century, the third and all the centuries, and is to-day the same organization as then, the same active, actual, visible Church always, with the same Apostolic succession and authority, and will be so until time shall be no more, for "Lo! He is with her till the end of the world."

Under the Catholic conception, as the Church spread, the Apostles, under the same divine authority under which they had selected Matthias, ordained other men to the ministry to help them in their work, "to be witnesses with them"; and as they, the Apostles, were passing out of life, those whom they had consecrated for that purpose became their successors in authority over the Church; and those in like manner and for a like purpose ordained others; and thus bishop consecrating bishop in the same manner, with the same authority, and for a like purpose, the Church has come down to us through all the ages and centuries since that first meeting in the upper chamber in Jerusalem.

She has in this way carefully guarded and kept her identity and her continuity all through these centuries, and has come down to us the one certain, definite organization, the Holy Apostolic Catholic Church always; with the same divine instruction, the same divine appointment, the same divine witness to the truth of Christianity, the same divine mission, the same Apostolic authority, the same divinely consecrated bishops and priests and deacons through all the centuries, on back to those first bishops who took charge of the church as the Apostles were passing out of the world.

Under this conception the Church is the authority for and witness and keeper of the Bible, the Bible being her own work under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and she cannot but regard as unnecessary and unwarranted and absolutely contrary to the plain letter of the Bible, the action of human beings in the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, or any other century in separating from her and starting other organizations as rivals of His own Church, the divinely organized Church He himself instituted. She realizes that the Church has not always been what she ought to be, has fallen far short of what He wants her to be (one of His own chosen twelve, under His own eyes, proved traitor), but when men, instead of using their talents to purify her, to drive away the errors and corruption, to lead her back to paths of peace and righteousness, turn their efforts to organizing institutions appearing to the world as rivals, denying her authority and claiming equal authority therewith, they cannot but work indescribable harm and injury to

His Church's mission, and are undermining the faith of men's souls.

This is the Catholic conception of the Church, and in thus pleading for unity on this basis we refer, in its broadest world-wide sense, to the great Catholic and Apostolic Church of the world, with which has come down to us the Apostolic succession and authority. This is composed of the several geographical divisions known as the Greek and Russian Communion, the Armenian Communion, the Roman Communion, the Anglican Communion, the Old Catholics, and some small communions.

The Catholic Church is marred by one great heresy and schism—the papal claim of the Roman Church—and to this is largely, if not wholly, due the present existence of so many Protestant churches. Between the Protestant system and the Catholic Church there is a distinct line of departure. On the Catholic side is the Faith once for all delivered; on the Protestant are only human opinions. On the Catholic side is found every shade of opinion, between Romanism and Protestantism, but only one faith; on the Protestant side the faith is split up and subordinated, if not lost sight of, in the varying opinions of their members. On the Catholic side only the faith is the test of membership; on the Protestant side, it is certain conditions and opinions. On the Catholic side the Bible is the product of the Church, a creation of the Church under divine guidance; on the Protestant, it is the basis of the Church. On the Catholic side are St. James, St. Jude, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Timothy, St. Titus, St. John, St. Matthias, St. Barnabas, St. Polycarp, St. Athanasius, St. Igna-

tius and all the other Apostles and their successors; on the other are Luther, Calvin, Knox, Zwingli, Melancthon, Coke, Asbury, Roger Williams, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Crumpler, Dowie, Eddy and the hundreds of other leaders. On the Catholic side we go back, through all ages of the Church, in one unbroken succession, Bishop by Bishop, to that upper chamber in Jerusalem where the eleven Apostles, who had been commissioned by our Saviour Himself, met and organized the Church, the first act of which was to select Matthias as the successor of Judas; on the Protestant side we go back with one body to Luther and stop, with another to Calvin and stop, with others to John Boccold, Robert Brown, Coke, Asbury, Campbell, Crumpler, Dowie and Eddy and stop.

The way to unity of Christians is going to be slow and laborious at best. There is the present established order of things to be interfered with, denominational pride and individual ambition and prejudice to be overcome, conflicting dogmas and doctrines to be reconciled, traditional though unessential positions to be abandoned, sentimental and long-standing ties to be given up and new associations formed. It is going to take self-sacrifice, patience, love, faith, hope, and charity, and above all, charity. The sectarianism of Protestantism is a great enough barrier to unity, but the greatest barrier of all is the despotic, unbrotherly, and unfriendly attitude of the Roman branch of the Catholic Church.

But so far as the union of English-speaking Christians on the Catholic basis is concerned, we must look to the Anglican Communion of this great Catholic and

Apostolic Church. She stands midway between the ecclesiastical despotism of the Roman Church and the ecclesiastical anarchy of sectarianism. It is true the Roman Communion is represented in English-speaking countries as a separate communion; but she has no business there any more than the Church of England would have in the United States as a separate communion from the Episcopal Church. The Roman Church is the communion of the Latin race, the same as the Anglican communion is that of the English race of people, each being equal component parts of the whole Universal Church. Rome has no more right or authority to claim supremacy over the English Church than the English Church has over the Roman.

Unity will never come as long as there are two Catholic churches in the same country not in communion with each other. The Roman Catholic Church as a distinct and different communion has no business in the same countries where the English Catholic Church is, and *vice versa,* and we can make very little headway in bringing together the scattered hosts of Protestants until this doubling-up of Catholic communions is done away with, in a mutual recognition by inter-communion and balancing of the points of variance.

The Roman Communion has forfeited a good deal of her catholicity in her assumption of Roman supremacy, and her excommunication of all Christians, however Catholic in their allegiance to the Church, and however Apostolic in their origin, who do not acknowledge her supremacy.

This brings us back again to the origin and cause of all schisms—Papal supremacy and infallibility. Unity can never come under the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope of Rome, as has already been shown, any more than it can under that of the Patriarch of the Greek Church or the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other one bishop, or any more than it can come under the individual infallibility of Protestantism.

If the Roman Church had emphasized her Catholicity instead of her Romanisms, there would have been nothing to protest against, as there is no possible way to protest against Catholicity. Catholicity is a quality by itself equally removed from Romanism and Protestantism. You cannot emphasize anything specially Roman or specially Protestant without sacrificing that much Catholicity. This Catholicity, pure and simple, is the only basis for unity. When Rome shall leave off her Romanism, retaining her Catholicity, and when Protestantism, tired and wearied of her sectarianism, shall seek reunion in the Catholic Church, we will indeed be one and the world will believe.

If there had been no Romanism in the Catholic Church, or if it had not become so pronounced and prominent, there would have been no Protestantism and no Sectarianism, and no division and schisms, and when in God's good time the Catholic Church shall free herself from these false Roman claims and become again the one Holy Apostolic Catholic Church, Protestantism and its accompanying sectarianism, schism and division will die away.

Just as the Primitive Church was one under the authority of all the Apostles and their successors, and

as it remained one as long as this was adhered to, so will the Church again be one under the collective Historic Episcopate, the successors of all the Apostles. Just as the division and schism was caused by the Roman heresy of supremacy and infallibility, so will these divisions be ended by the abandonment of these claims.

Our Roman brethren can defer this as long as they continue to persist in such a distortion of the truth as their uncatholic, unscriptural claims of supremacy. It lies with them to relinquish their inconsistencies and be one with us, or to continue the schism by dividing the Catholic Communion here. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the Primate or Patriarch of the whole Anglican Communion just as the Bishop or Pope of Rome is the Primate of the Latin Church—no more and no less. They are both bishops of the Catholic Church just as other bishops are, only they are called and elected to be primate or executive head of their respective portions of the Catholic Church—first among their equals.

It is undoubtedly true that the Pope of Rome was, in the early days, the Primate of the Universal Catholic Church, the early fathers having naturally and properly given this honor to Rome as the imperial city, and he would doubtless have remained Primate, without question or comment, if he had not assumed supremacy. The Primacy of the Church, one and united again, could be cheerfully granted to Rome now in the interest of unity. This is all she should want, and she should accept it as a matter of ecclesiastical convenience, and not as having anything to do

with St. Peter or *Jure divino.* Certainly, it is the only way. The effort to unify the Latin and Anglican Churches by the exchange of the Roman acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican Orders for the Anglican recognition of the Papal claims of the Roman Church, is such an absurd, foolish delusion that it is strange any sensible person should take it seriously. It cannot be successful. We have not argued for the validity of Anglican orders, because to us it is self-evident, and we have no doubt every honest, learned, sincere Roman Catholic knows they are valid, and to argue it would not convince those prejudiced and not open to conviction. They are valid, so far as their succession from the Apostles and Catholic Bishops is concerned, and it is not necessary to valid ordination, however desirable it might be, that the Bishop of Rome shall authorize or agree to it. Ordination in a communion, recognizing the equal authority of the successors of all the Apostles, rather than the despotic assumption of supremacy on the part of one, might even be considered more regular.* If Rome is

---

* If any person wishes to inform himself as to the Anglican orders or as to the historical continuity and succession of the English Church, I advise him to read such books as Brown's "Church for Americans," Gores' "Roman Catholic Claims," Little's "Reasons for Being a Churchman," Cutt's "Turning Points of English Church History," Denny's "Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction," and many other church books on this question. There were Bishops from the English Church at the Council of Arles in 314, and as it must have taken long periods in those crude days to establish any system, the very fact of there being bishops of the Church of England at all at that

as certain of the validity of her Papal claims as the Anglican Church is of her orders, then the unity of these two Catholic churches is well nigh hopeless. We have done and are doing all we can for unity. We could cheerfully grant the Primacy, as above stated, to Rome, for sake of unity, but it is utterly beyond all possibility for us to acknowledge that one Apostle was supreme over the others, or that any human being, no mat-

---

time, shows that the Church had been there many years. Twelve hundred years later, in 1534, after many vicissitudes, many trials, the same Church of England, under the successors of these same Bishops of old, declared that the "Bishop of Rome hath no more jurisdiction in this land conferred on him by God than any other foreign Bishop." And when she would no longer be dominated by the Roman Bishop, he ordered his people to leave the Church of England. There was no change in the orders, or succession, or organization, of the Church of England. She was the same Church always—in the beginning, at the Reformation, and now. Instead of the English Church springing from Rome, or in any way leaving Rome, or being formed by dissatisfied Roman Catholics, the contrary is true. Dissatisfied Roman Catholics left her. There never was in those twelve hundred years, even at the greatest height of papal domination, any *Roman* Catholic Church in England. She was never even *called* the *Roman* Catholic Church, nor were her members ever called or known as *Roman* Catholics. She was always the Church of England, the Catholic Church of the English people. She was in communion with Rome as long as Rome remained truly Catholic, and she will be again in communion with her when she again becomes truly Catholic. When asked "Where was the Episcopal Church before Henry VIII?" one of our clergymen replied, "Where were you this morning before you took your bath?"

ter how great and good, is or can be, or ought to be, or was intended by our Saviour to be, infallible. We could hope for the early realization of the unity of Christendom if Rome would abandon this unnatural position and help us say to our Protestant brethren, in the words of Abram of old: "Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen, for we be brethren."

The Anglican Communion is the meeting-ground between the extremes of ecclesiastical positions. She is equally removed from the Romanisms of the Roman Church and the sectarianisms of Protestantism. She does not concede to any man, even the Pope of Rome, to change, or add to, or develop, the faith once delivered, the truth unvarying and unchangeable; nor does she concede to every man the right to be his own infallible guide and expounder of that faith that was delivered into the keeping of the Apostles and their successors. She is Catholic, for she embraces every truth of God and protests against every error of man. She most surely holds the basis for unity. The Roman Church can never, so far as man can see, go to Protestantism, nor Protestantism go to Rome. If they are ever to unite and be one, as our Saviour prayed, they must meet in English-speaking countries, in the Anglican Communion. The sooner our Protestant brethren come to us, the sooner will we be able to overcome the Papal schism in English-speaking countries, and the sooner our English brethren now in the Papal schism throw in their lots with the English Catholic Church, the sooner will we bring back our scattered brethren in the Protestant Communions.

This book is a plea for the reunion of English-speaking Christians in the Anglican Communion of the Catholic Church, and while it is not intended to explain all the doctrines, practices, dogmas, liturgy, and ritual of the Catholic Church as a whole, nor of the Anglican portion in particular, it is hoped the reader will be impressed with the Catholic basis of unity in the Historic Church. No man reaches the full height of the Catholic Church all at once. Once he grasps the Catholic idea and spirit, he grows away from Romanism, Protestantism, and Sectarianism.

If our brethren, now scattered through so many Protestant communions, shall ever come to understand the one great truth we have tried so hard to convey in this little book, and grasp the true Catholic conception that the Church is a divine organism, a living thing, in living vital union with its Head, Jesus Christ—"I am the vine, ye are the branches"—organized by His Apostles under His instructions, continued and perpetuated under those same instructions by the successors to those Apostles, the Bishops of the Church of God: If they shall ever come to realize that this Church is here in their midst, and that schism from her is sinful and unscriptural; that her authority is from Him, and that her ministry and her priesthood are His representatives, then how quickly will the many little differences that have kept them away from her melt away! How trifling, how insignificant will many differences then appear that had before loomed up as insurmountable! How many mountains will then appear as only mole hills! How many ideas, dogmas, and opinions that had been stressed, and stressed almost to the point of breaking,

that would then appear as so much wasted time! How many prejudices, false doctrines, notions, and heresies could then be consigned to the rubbish heaps! It would then be seen what a waste of time and thought it is to worry our minds over such matters as mode of baptism, predestination, and church government, when all we would then want to know would be what the Church teaches? We would then feel that all our little children should be baptized, because His Church teaches us so. Congregations would not then vote "yea" or "nay" on the acceptance of a person into that kingdom which our Saviour said was like a net that gathers both good and bad. Confirmation would then be recognized as one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and its administration would be confined to the bishops of the church as an Apostolic rite. The Presbyterian government and the Congregational government would not then be held up as the Apostolic government when the Church says its government was always Episcopal!

We do not claim that the Anglican communion—either the Episcopal Church in the United States, or the English Church, just as they are now in practice, and in polity, without any change whatever, is the only absolute way to unity, but, that being Apostolical in her origin, her orders, her succession and authority, and being Catholic in her disposition and discipline, and rendered thereby adaptable and comprehensive, she offers the best, if not the only, basis for English-speaking Christians.*

* See extracts from Journal General Convention and Pastoral Letter at end of this book.

There is nothing that we can imagine, save human misunderstanding and prejudice resulting therefrom, that stands in the way of unity of all English Christians in the Anglican portion of the Catholic Church. There is nothing exclusive in it. There are no set rules of conduct and action to follow other than those covered by our blessed Saviour's own words: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"; no private opinions to give up, except such as would leave in their place a higher, more exalted opinion of the Church's divine origin and mission; no one special article of faith overstressed, and none undervalued. Those who believe in immersion are members of the Church Catholic on the same footing as those who believe in affusion. The Church does not require that a person shall be baptized by any particular mode, immersion, or affusion, but that he shall be baptized in the name of the Trinity—The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. One man may be more dutiful, more loyal to the Church's teachings, and have his children baptized, and another may refuse, and yet both are members of the Catholic Church. Remembering our Saviour's words to "suffer little children to come unto Him, and forbid them not," and feeling that the fold under the great Shepherd should contain the lambs as well as the sheep, the Church teaches the baptism of children for the purpose of consecrating them to God, making them members of His Church, and she would have all her members follow this teaching, but the man who does not, does not sacrifice membership in the Church. He is denying his own children a valuable privilege, and may be doing an irreparable wrong.

The Church does not require or forbid any *opinion* on any subject consistent with the Catholic creeds, but she does require and teach always, everywhere, to all people, that a man must believe what is contained in the Catholic Creeds—the faith once for all delivered—and all actions, all opinions contrary to, or inconsistent therewith, must be abandoned by every loyal churchman.

The Church is not based on opinions; nor does she hold or exploit any *opinions*. She only holds and teaches the Christian faith centuries old. She allows all her members the freest expression of their opinion consistent with this faith and the practice of the Catholic Church. What she is vitally concerned about is to "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered," "to go into all the world and preach the gospel," "to be witnesses of Him unto the uttermost parts of the earth." She encourages all useful investigation, all progress in literature, science, art, and education; she does not forbid her members any lawful amusement; she does not cry down any healthy enjoyment; she does raise her voice against all vice, all intemperance, all abuse, all error, all wrong-doing. She affirms all the truths of Christianity, and protests against all error and false doctrines.

Says Bishop Brown: "As actual proof that it is possible for Christians of every name to unite here in one organic body, let me call attention to the notable fact that representatives of all doctrinal and governmental views are now, and long have been, standing upon this ground. We have in this church some who are, in respect to their views of God's mercy, Armenians, Calvinists, and Universalists. The Roman, Zwinglian,

and Lutheran doctrines of the Sacraments have their advocates, or at least would be tolerated among us. The same is true of the distinctive doctrines of the Baptists, Methodists, Adventists, Disciples, and others. Concerning the vexed question of church government, we have High Churchmen, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Indifferentists. There is a sprinkling of those who advocate and practice an extreme Ritualism, such as could scarcely be duplicated in Roman usage, and others who, in spirit, and so far as possible in practice, are severe Puritans. There are subjectivists and externalists; literalists and rationalists; the votaries of society and the recluse—all these schools of doctrine, government, worship, and conduct are now actually to be found among both the clergy and laymen of the Episcopal Church.

"The idea for which many of the denominations stand finds recognition in the Episcopal Church. The Presbyterian will find, upon investigation, that the authority of the Presbytery is duly recognized in the government of the church and the ordination of elders; the congregationalist, that our parishes are sufficiently independent of each other, and that the laity have enough to say concerning ecclesiastical affairs; the Lutheran, that the necessity of faith is taught; the Methodist, that the church in which John Wesley lived and died lays a great deal of stress upon conversion and sanctification; the Baptist, that he can immerse without let or hindrance, and that though baptism is administered in unconscious infancy, it is not completed until confirmation is received upon an intelligent confession of faith; the Romanist, that the necessity of

unity and catholicity is emphasized; and so on through the whole long list.

"It appears, then, that almost any person, no matter what his peculiarity or belief, can find room enough in this Church, providing only that he sincerely accepts the cardinal doctrines of the Catholic creeds, grammatically and historically interpreted, and will tolerate the eccentricities and whims of others, who, like himself, purely believe that the salvation of the world depends upon some little pet idea. If a man can make up his mind to live and let live, he can ride into the Episcopal Church on almost any hobby, and remain mounted without fear of molestation during the remainder of life. Hobbyists are never excluded from a truly comprehensive and Catholic Church such as ours. They often exclude themselves because they are too narrow, intolerant, and self-willed to remain where others, as well as they, have liberty." (*"The Church for Americans."*)

To call the Church exclusive is the "unkindest cut of all." She only excludes from her membership those who do not accept Christ as the Divine Saviour of the World, and from her communion, those who openly live notoriously evil lives. "It strikes one," says Bishop Thompson, "as a queer thing, that people should charge the Church with exclusiveness; that they should take their own special sin and lay it on her shoulders. The Church was not holy enough, did not put such barriers as they desired, and so they separated to set up a sect to exclude all they felt were not worthy. The only body in any land which demands only *Christianity* as a test of membership, which does not supplement

Christianity with some *ism,* is the Catholic Church."

The only fence around the Catholic Church is of our Saviour's own building. Is she to be considered exclusive because she does not practice an exchange of pulpits? This would be to acknowledge that the division of Christians is right and proper, contrary to the Bible pleadings. It is her protest against division, and her position, that only *one pulpit* is necessary or right, that she does not do this. The Church excludes no one. If other Christians exclude themselves, must the Church, in order to be liberal, give up her principles, change her unvarying practice for nineteen hundred years, prove false to the trust she has held so long, deny her divine origin, and thus weaken the only authority that can bring us peace and security? Must she, contrary to Scripture, admit the lawfulness of and encourage division and separation, and, by an exchange of pulpits, set her seal of approval on humanly organized societies separate and apart from her? Is she to be called exclusive because she still holds to the old paths and does not change with every passing age? The Church holds to the same position she has held for nineteen centuries. Every person is admitted to her membership or to her orders on exactly the same terms. There is no partiality.

Her only conditions are acceptance of the Catholic Creeds and the moral law. There is nothing of human construction to keep any one out. The Church allows her children to hold any views they please consistent with the Catholic Creeds, which are only statements of the New Testament faith, in so simple a form, there is no danger of misunderstanding it. They can hold

views of Calvin, Williams, Wesley, etc., but she does refuse to let these opinions bar out others who are of different temperament. Holding the Church to be a divine institution, that Kingdom of Heaven, which our Saviour compares to the net that gathered all, both good and bad, and that God alone has the right to impose condition of entrance, she must refuse to make human opinions barriers to her membership. This would be to force separation and division among Christians contrary to the Saviour's prayer and pleading. It is this that causes so many religious bodies. One holds one view on some matter; another holds another. One stresses this, another that; some will only allow others to walk their road on their own conditions, and thus they divide off. The Church places no such barriers or conditions.

Every person in the world, of whatever name or communion, however peculiar his opinions or his organization, if duly baptized in the name of the Trinity, is recognized by the Catholic Church as a member of the Church; whether loyal or disloyal, remains with the person. Whether united in the body Catholic or holding closer allegiance to some religious organization away from the Church, whether under the care of her ordained ministers or under those of the various denominations, no matter where they are, or what they are, whether voluntary or involuntary, they are still members of the Church; and their remaining away from her is their own voluntary action, and not that of the Church. What, then, prevents unity? Why should Christians remain away from us?

The old saying that "the church has nothing to do with either politics or religion," is only true in that she

will not allow "politics or religion" to interfere with her Christianity.

The Church is the witness and keeper of the faith. She can never lose this faith; she can never change this faith; she must keep this faith pure because she was organized for this purpose. She testifies to the truths and facts of Christianity; to the miraculous supernatural origin of it. Her very existence, her very origin, her very and only reason for existence is this. She is based on these. She could not exist at all without them, therefore her very continuous existence testifies to these facts.

Read the Apostles' Creed, and see if you do not believe it. This is all there is to it. This is the faith once delivered—the simple faith of the Apostles. This is the Creed the Church had before the many books of the Bible were written, and long before the Catholic Church selected and placed her seal of approval upon those Scriptures which she did not question. This Creed, the faith once for all delivered, is repeated at every service of the Church, however simple or however magnificent. It is taught to the little children in the Sunday-schools. Sponsors repeat it at the baptism of little children. These children themselves repeat it when they are confirmed, and it is repeated when the last sad rites are spoken over them when laid in their final resting place.

In this humble way we have tried to convey some idea of the Church of the English race, the Anglican communion of the Universal Catholic Church equally removed as she is from the despotism, the bigotry, and additions to the faith, of the Roman system and the fanaticism, exclusiveness, and sectarianism of the Protestant

system. What she really is, neither we nor any human being can describe in all her beauty, because she is and must be divine.

As Dr. Powers says: "Arraying herself in chaste and simple ornaments, as becomes the dignified and the pure, she is presented comely and attractive, the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley."

"She is in no wise, under no circumstances, exclusive—she is adapted to all—she is fanatical nowhere in anything—she is Catholic. Her liturgy meets every demand of worship and is fitted to every use. Beautiful, dependent, not on man, it is always beautiful—fixed and complete, no man is ever conscious of lack in it.

"Singing the canticles written by the minstrel prophet, the congregations chant God's praises in God's words, sending to God her exquisite prayers and litany. The people, led by the minister, repeat those sacred expressions of the heart which in the old and cruel days fortified the weak for death and martyrdom, and made noble Christian manhood out of the virtueless heathen. Look back on the woeful days of the Church's fearful, terrible struggle; remember that this liturgy was her worship then, man's speech to God; recall their strength and their success, and your appreciation must begin to grow and grow, as you certainly find it helping you in your Christian life. Of its beauty I am not competent to speak. It is a very standard of pure English, voicing chaste and exalted thought; once a month it orders the book of Psalms to be read through, once a year the Old Testament, and twice in that time the New Testament. The great events in our Lord's

sacrificial life it regularly presents and their great revelation and value. It continually recalls the exemplary lives of the holy men of old, impressing on us all the lessons of their lives.

"Not a man or woman in any condition, in any walk of life anywhere on the earth, who may not find it in that sympathetic and expressive language which shall satisfactorily ask of God his soul's want, and not a ceremony does he need that is not provided by established custom in connection and in conformity with the various offices of the Prayer Book.

"She is come, as was her Lord, 'to sinners, and not to the righteous," built upon the foundations of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, "the House of God," the Kingdom of Heaven, on earth, the pillar and ground of the truth. On her banner of old was wrought the Christian legend, the everlasting creed, and on her banner now you see it. Faithfully she keeps her sacred trust, "the faith which was once delivered to the saints," ever preaching the true word of God and administering the sacraments, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. Adapted to all, excluding none, her holy rites are those of Scripture, and her liturgy the noblest worship God's Kingdom on earth ever offered before the great white throne above." (*"Why Not, and Why?"*)

In the closing chapter of Dr. George Hodges' book on the Episcopal Church is the following beautiful presentation of the Catholicity of the Church of the English people:

"Concerning the ritual of this sacrament (the Lord's

Supper), the Episcopal Church shows a wide latitude. It is celebrated upon a table or upon an altar. The officiating minister, who is attired either in a surplice or in a chasuble, stands either before the altar facing eastward, or behind the table facing westward. Sometimes the service is read by daylight, sometimes by candle-light. Here there are flowers; there there are no flowers. This one reads the prayers; that one sings or intones them.

"Some people object to this variety of ritual. The daylight people would have no candles. The chasuble people would have no standing behind tables. But all this variety exists in the Church, and the wisest people are glad of it. After all, it is true that there are only two kinds of churchmen—broad and narrow. The broad churchmen are those who recognize the fact of difference, who see plainly that God has not made us all alike. We are not all helped by simplicity, though some are. We are not all helped by incense and processional crosses, though some are. The peculiar glory of the Episcopal Church is that there is place within her borders for all sorts of people, and a welcome for every kind of temperament, and a ministry for every variety of man. The only kind of ritual which seriously contradicts the spirit of the Episcopal Church is that which exalts itself above righteousness, which sets more emphasis on colors than it does on charity, and which cares more for mint, anise, and cummin than it does for judgment, mercy, truth and brotherly love.

"Indeed, these pages have quite failed of their purpose if they have not shown that the Episcopal Church is built like the pattern which St. John saw in the

Revelation, four-square, facing the four corners of the earth, and with three doors on every side, and these doors wide open, so that there is far more door than wall. To keep the Church from narrowness, from pettiness, from lapsing into sectarianism; to preserve its catholicity, its recognition of the difference between the essential and the non-essential, its relation to all the varying needs of human nature, its spiritual sanity, its religious hospitality—this is what we must do if we would have the Church of the English-speaking people of the past to be the Church of the English-speaking people of the future."

It is this Church, the Catholic Church of the English race, that offers a basis of unity for English-speaking Christians free from the bigotry of Rome and the sectarianism of Protestantism. This Church, the Anglo-Saxon portion of the Universal Church, the same divine organism in all ages, the same in the primitive days of Christianity, the same through all the darkness, and persecutions and martyrdom, through those dark days of the dark ages when she, amid a world of ignorance and superstition, was faithful to her trust—the faith once delivered—and was slowly but surely bringing the world from barbarity and savagery to the light of Christianity; the same Church always! Though marred sometimes by human errors and corruption, tossed to and fro sometimes, and "carried about by every wind of doctrine," yet never for one moment of time has she lost her identity or her connection with Him Who promised to be with her till the end of the world. And though sore troubled now by the schism and separation of her children and their wandering

so far from her fold, she yet hopes for their return in God's good time, and awaits with patience and faith, the fulfillment of our Saviour's prayer, when we all will be one, and the world will believe.

Then there will be no more misunderstandings, no more envy, no more strife, no more bitterness, no more suspicion, no more dissension, and no more criticism—all striving together for the faith of the gospel—no more controversy, no more contention, save that noble contention, or rather emulation, of those who can best work and best agree; no more passing and repassing of people, members of the same Christian family, children of the same God, going to different churches; some going to the Presbyterian Church, some to the Methodist, some to the Disciple, some to the Baptist, some to the Lutheran, some to the Congregational, some to the Roman, and others to others—but all going together to the same church. No more Baptists, no more Methodists, no more Presbyterians, no more Disciples, no more Congregationalists, no more partisans, no more division and schisms—all members of the one body of Christ, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. No more Methodist Missionaries, no more Presbyterian Missionaries, no more Lutheran Missionaries, no more Disciple Missionaries, no more Baptist Missionaries, no more partisan missionaries—all missionaries of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, to which was given the commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel." "As my Father hath sent Me so send I you." No more waste of money and men in sending dozens of ministers and missionaries to the same place. The money contributed in New York,

London, Rome, St. Petersburg, and in far away South Africa, in India, in Persia or Armenia, in Alaska or in No Man's Land—from everywhere—will all go into one general fund to send the gospel to the heathen, or to relieve sickness and pain and suffering and sorrow, and misfortune and distress, wherever and whenever in all the world it is needed.

Thus we will show "how pleasant and how good a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," until the coming of that great day, when the Church Militant shall forever after be one with the Church Triumphant; when that "great multitude which no man can number of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues shall stand before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes and with palms in their hands"; "and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away." (Rev. vii. 9 and xx. 1-4.)

"Though with a scornful wonder
Men see her sore opprest,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distrest;
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
Their cry goes up, "how long"?
And soon the night of weeping
Shall be the morn of song.

"Mid toil and tribulation
And tumult of her war,
She waits the consummation
Of peace for evermore;
Till with the vision glorious
Her longing eyes are blest,
And the great Church victorious
Shall be the Church at rest."

EXTRACT FROM JOURNAL GENERAL CONVENTION, 1886.

"In pursuance of the action taken 1853 for the healing of the divisions among Christians in our own land, and in 1880, for the protection and encouragement of those who had withdrawn from the Roman Obedience, we, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Council assembled as Bishops in the Church of God, do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow-Christians of the different Communions in this land, who, in their several spheres, have contended for the religion of Christ:

"1. Our earnest desire that the Saviour's prayer, 'That we all may be one,' may in its deepest and truest sense be speedily fulfilled.

"2. That we believe all who have been duly baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are members of the Holy Catholic Church.

"3. That in all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline, or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.

"4. That this Church does not seek to absorb other Communions, but rather co-operating with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces, and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.

"But, furthermore, we do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired by the memorialists can be restored only by the return of all Christian Communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore in-

capable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.

"As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to-wit:

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.

"2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

"3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

"4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

"*Furthermore*, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which affect the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, as soon as there shall be any authorized response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian Bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

EXTRACT FROM PASTORAL LETTER 1892.

"For many years the thoughts and prayers of your Bishops have been greatly occupied with the unhappy divisions among Christian people. The evils of these divisions are becoming daily more apparent. Faith grows cold, doubts increase, attacks on the very citadel of religion are more defiant, because the Lord's own chosen evidence of His Divine Mission is cast contemptuously aside by those who profess to honor Him.

" 'That they all may be one,' He prayed, "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.' They are not 'all one,' and the world does not believe. We may say we are at heart or in spirit 'all one'; but alas! if it be so, the world does not see it. A divided Christendom makes an impossible appeal to human credulity when, notwithstanding all men's eyes see and their ears hear, it declares that it is still 'all one' in the profound sense of our Lord's last prayer.

"In our Pastoral Letter and in our Declaration of 1886 we set forth the grounds upon which the Church stands for unity. They were substantially adopted and proclaimed in the Lambeth Declaration of 1888 by the assembled Episcopate of the whole Anglican Communion. In that Declaration we set aside all mere matters of preference, and many things that are very precious to our hearts and yours. We came down to the bare foundations, without which no organized Christianity can long continue to exist. We said in effect that, for the sake of the oneness our dear Lord prayed for on the night in which He was betrayed, we would yield, if need were, all but these 'first principles.'

"We expected no result. We were casting seed into the ground which was to grow in God's time. By some our words were misunderstood; by other they were carelessly dismissed; but there were a few who saw their meaning, who considered them seriously, who have endeavored to weigh them justly, and who have consequently been drawn

very near to us in sympathy. The result has been no disappointment. In any case we have borne our testimony. We have delivered our own souls. We have made our protest against an ancient wrong. We took the Apostolic position.

"The Church stands for unity. She stands for the one Catholic brotherhood of Christian men, for the ancient freedom of Christian thinking and Christian action, for deliverance from the tyranny of man-made Creeds and Confessions. She is the 'pillar and ground' of the unchangeable 'truth,' the 'witness and keeper' through the ages of 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' She stands for the liberty wherewith the Truth has made Her free. Let her children 'pray for the peace of Jerusalem.' Let them banish all narrowness and prejudice, all pride and conceit. Let them gladly acknowledge all that is good and gracious in our separated brethren. Let them say, 'Grace be unto all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' Unity will come as a crown of victory, not to theological strife, but to Christian love. From the long story of the Church's warfare let us learn that the conquests of love are the only conquests which abide. Be steadfast. Be patient of men's prejudices and weakness. Pray on and hope on. Hold out loving hands to men, and so shall the Lord's last prayer find, in His own time, its answer."

A FINAL WORD TO THE READER.

Do not lay this book aside with the feeling that, after all, it is only another argument for the Episcopal Church. It is not primarily nor mainly an argument for the Episcopal Church. It is a plea for the unity of Christians and applies to the Episcopal Church only insofar as the Historic Catholic Church of the English people, of which she is a branch, offers the true basis for this unity, and no farther. If there are unsound or biased arguments herein the author will welcome suggestions regarding them for future editions. If you have any other or better or truer basis it should be presented to the Christian world. If you have none, will you be doing your duty if, through prejudice, you cast this effort contemptuously aside, when, by passing it on to your neighbor, you might in some degree help to bring to pass what our Saviour prayed for, "That They All May Be one"?

THE AUTHOR.

If any one is interested enough to pursue the study of this question further, we recommend among numbers of other books on the same subject, the following:

"The Church for Americans"—Bishop Brown.

"Why Not and Why"—Dr. W. D. Powers.

"Catholic Principles"—Rev. F. N. Westcott.

"Come Home"—Rev. John Langtry.

"Rightly Instructed in God's Holy Word"—Bishop Beckwith.

"Faith of Our Forefathers"—Stearns.

"Reasons for Being a Churchman"—Rev. A. W. Little.

"Romanism and Sectarianism"—Rev. Geo. C. Betts,

"Turning Points in General Church History."

"Turning Points in English Church History."

"The Episcopal Church"—Dr. George Hodges.

Kipps' "Double Witness."

"Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism"—Dr. J. Newman Smyth.

280.3 Q
H137

Layman pseud.

"That they all may be one".

4-20/22 Buell 5/4/22

280.3 Q
H137

C